





Volume XXV

JUNE 1939

Number 3

Bulletin
of
The American Association
of
University Professors

Editor

Ralph E. Himstead

Editorial Committee

Joseph Allen

Paul Kaufman

E. C. Kirkland

Fernandus Payne

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Sts., Easton, Pa.

Editorial Office: 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

Issued bimonthly in February, April, June, October, and December. Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions (including Canada) are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

MARK H. INGRAHAM (*Mathematics*)

University of Wisconsin

VICE-PRESIDENTS

ALZADA COMSTOCK (*Economics*)
A. C. KREY (*History*)

Mount Holyoke College
 University of Minnesota

GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (*Law*)

Washington Office

TERM MEMBERS

1937-1939

WILLIAM R. ARTHUR (<i>Law</i>)	University of Colorado
J. B. BULLITT (<i>Pathology</i>)	University of North Carolina
L. A. DOGGETT (<i>Electrical Engineering</i>)	Pennsylvania State College
D. G. FOSTER (<i>Chemistry</i>)	Swarthmore College
A. N. HOLCOMBE (<i>Government</i>)	Harvard University
SIDNEY HOOK (<i>Philosophy</i>)	New York University
ROBERT E. MATHEWS (<i>Law</i>)	Ohio State University
DR SCOTT (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Missouri
S. STEPHENSON SMITH (<i>English</i>)	University of Oregon
WILLIS G. SWARTZ (<i>Political Science</i>)	Illinois State Normal University (Southern)

1938-1940

HENRY K. BENSON (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Washington
GEORGE BOAS (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Johns Hopkins University
WALTER G. CADY (<i>Physics</i>)	Wesleyan University
ARTHUR C. COLE (<i>History</i>)	Western Reserve University
WILLIAM McGUFFEY HEPBURN (<i>Law</i>)	University of Alabama
E. J. LUND (<i>Zoology</i>)	University of Texas
GEORGE C. ROBINSON (<i>Government</i>)	Iowa State Teachers College
EUNICE MORGAN SCHENCK (<i>French</i>)	Bryn Mawr College
T. V. SMITH (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Chicago
COLSTON E. WARNE (<i>Economics</i>)	Amherst College

1939-1941

BLANCHE H. DOW (<i>French</i>)	Missouri State Teachers College (Northwest)
HORACE N. GILBERT (<i>Economics</i>)	California Institute of Technology
HORACE M. GRAY (<i>Economics</i>)	University of Illinois
CHARLES B. HALE (<i>English</i>)	University of Maryland
VICTOR D. HILL (<i>Classical Languages</i>)	Ohio University
H. M. HOSFORD (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Arkansas
ERNEST F. LANGLEY (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
EVERETT V. STONEQUIST (<i>Sociology</i>)	Skidmore College
G. SAFFORD TORREY (<i>Botany</i>)	Connecticut State College
EARL L. VANCE (<i>Journalism</i>)	Florida State College for Women

EX-PRESIDENTS

W. W. COOK (*Law*)
S. A. MITCHELL (*Astronomy*)
A. J. CARLSON (*Physiology*)

Northwestern University
 University of Virginia
 University of Chicago

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*)

Goucher College

CONTENTS

LOYALTIES AND FREEDOM IN EDUCATION, <i>O. O. Norris</i>	265
PLANNING A UNIVERSITY'S FUTURE, <i>J. Alton Burdine</i>	275
THE COLLEGE PROFESSOR AND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, <i>Clair Wilcox</i>	284
THE FACULTY AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION, <i>Franklyn Snyder</i>	295
CONTRIBUTORS.....	309
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE—UNIVERSITY OF TENNES- SEE.....	310
ASSOCIATION NEWS	
Council Meeting.....	320
Regional and State Meetings.....	320
Athens, Ohio; Lawrence, Kansas; Seattle, Wash- ington	320-325
Chapter Activities.....	325
Albion College; Cornell University; University of Min- nesota; Monmouth College; Mount Holyoke College; University of New Hampshire; University of South Dakota; Swarthmore College; Syracuse University; Wesleyan University.....	325-327
EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION	
Academic Freedom and Tenure, <i>Henry M. Wriston</i>	328
COMMUNICATIONS.....	344
Professional Association or Trade Union? <i>G. A. Coe, A. O. Lovejoy</i>	344
Faculty Compensation for Extension Courses, <i>J. E. W. Wallin</i>	356
MEMBERSHIP.....	359
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	368

Censured Administrations

Investigations by this Association of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not maintaining conditions of academic freedom and tenure in accordance with academic custom and usage as formulated in the 1925 Washington Conference Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and endorsed by this Association, by the Association of American Colleges, and by representatives of the American Association of University Women, the Association of American Universities, the Association of Governing Boards, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, the Association of Urban Universities, the National Association of State Universities, and the American Council on Education.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited by this Association either upon the whole of that institution or upon the faculty, but specifically upon its present administration. This procedure does not affect the eligibility of non-members for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list only by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the dates of these actions by the Annual Meeting are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations:

Brenau College, Gainesville, Georgia	December, 1933
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh,	December, 1935
Pennsylvania (March, 1935, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 224-266)	
Board of Administration (North Dakota) (December, 1938 (December, 1938, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 585-597)	

LOYALTIES AND FREEDOM IN EDUCATION

By O. O. NORRIS

Michigan State Normal College

My subject implies three ideas that are of crucial importance for all persons interested in education. But their importance far transcends that implied in the traditional conception of them, for any society that makes any claim of marching under a banner of freedom, democracy, humanism, or science. These three ideas are those denoted by the expressions "academic freedom," "loyalty," and "education." I shall discuss them in the reverse of the order here named.

I

First, I propose to distinguish between education and mere teaching. For teaching is implied in education, but is not the whole of it. As the genius of our language suggests, in the two kinds of grammatical object that the active verb "teach" may take, teaching may be either one of two types of process. We say that we teach our learners subject matters. Expanding this statement, we may say that we teach subject matters to our learners, or that we teach our learners by means of subject matters. If we concentrate upon the former process, we exhibit ourselves as formalists and drill-masters. This attitude is perhaps to a certain degree necessary in working with the basic, tool subjects, in elementary education. But when we carry upward this drill-master procedure, into matters of interpretation, we become authoritarians and indoctrinators.

"Education," in the proper historical sense of the term, means a "leading forth," or "leadership." It does not mean drill-mastership, nor drivership. The situations constituted of the educator and his subject matters should be such as winsomely to induce curiosity, interest, and effort directed towards the ends held in

view by the educator and suggested to his learners. To be an educator, a leader-forth, one must thus be ahead of his learners in the possession not only of skills and knowledges, but also of the properly humanistic ends towards which these skills and knowledges are to be appropriately directed. It is not his business authoritarianly to command adoption of these ends, but only to suggest them. When it comes to a matter of rationalizing or justifying these ends, this can be done only by reference to still further ends, implicit in the nature of the life process of our kind. Our ends it is that authorize us to do what we rationally do; these are our proper authorities. Ends determine means. They do not justify means, unless the ends themselves are humanly justifiable—in terms of still further humanistic ends. The educator is not an end to his students, but a means; and the kind of ends by which he directs his own efforts determines the kind of educator that he will be. And just as his own efforts are motivated by the ends that he has voluntarily and enthusiastically espoused, so must he expect it to be with his students. In a free, democratic society, there can be no forcing of ends. And on the other hand, a society that was devoted to the remote ends of a really humanistic life could be no other than a free and hence democratic society. The true educator is a prophet of such a society, through being a prophet of the ends and means by which such a society must carry on.

If such be the proper attitude of the educator, then his very voice and presence will be of the type that will win confidence, and willing and enthusiastic effort. He has no need to speak with the "voice of authority." In fact, the traditional "voice of authority" is most likely to be a witless defense gesture for the glossing over of ignorance. Moreover, any one familiar with the history of human thought knows full well how the certainties of one age have become the uncertainties or even the acknowledged errors of the next. The attitude of the real educator is that of the leader of a rationally directed pioneering exploration. He must be possessed of a respectable amount of alertness and curiosity for new findings and new interpretations, that he himself has never before suspected, even over the same course. For often enough has this very thing happened, even in the conduct of elementary education.

In other words, the attitude of the educator at his best, in whatever field, is that of the teaching scientist. It is the attitude of trying to act and speak as appositely as possible in relation to his individuated facts, in all their structural and functional, or space-time relations; and thence of trying to act and speak the language of a statistical universality; and of helping his students to appreciate and develop the same sort of attitude. The scientist's criterion of universality is a two-edged sword. On the one hand, it requires that he serve universal humanity as a special agent for the investigating and reporting of his field of facts. On the other, it requires that, as a mouthpiece of his special kind of facts to universal man, he speak them truly, both descriptively and interpretatively. The authority of the scientist, for his fellow man, does not consist in the vigor of his speech or writing. It consists in his exhibition of the postulates of his thought, and of his objectives, and of how he came by these, and in his exhibition of his evidence, and of how he secured this. Such frankness must characterize the intellectual commerce of the educator with his students, as he seeks to lead them to a similar critical candor, and to the acquisition of skills in exhibiting it, without offense.

Now all sciences, and the techniques by which they are most successfully prosecuted, must be propagated from generation to generation, by the educative process. Both science and education, at their best, are undoubtedly phases of the life of mankind as a phylum or species, and recognition of the fact can hardly do otherwise than improve both their motivation and their techniques. It might at first appear that the adoption of such a view of science by its practitioners would tend to infect it with prejudice and so corrupt it, as is happening in Germany. It does indeed imply a bias, but a bias towards universality, in both of the two aspects that I have already described. As between a bias towards universality and a bias towards partiality, in either of these aspects, I leave it to the scientist and the scientific educator to choose. There can be no middle ground here, in a fully rational life.

II

In these days of rampant nationalism, and of rival intra-national or functional groups demanding each its own brand of loy-

alty, with the consequent imposition of loyalty oaths upon educators, there need be no apology for including the topic of loyalty in my subject group.

However loyalty as a factual process is to be described by the psychology of the future, it is naturally implicated in man's social nature: first, in the aid required by an ever newly rising generation, through its long period of immaturity and relative helplessness; and second, in the mutual aid thus made necessary between parents and among the elder generation as a whole. In these respects we find it among even the lower species—the more conspicuously, the more highly social and hence the more highly intelligent they are. The discerning of this fact, with abundant illustration of it, we owe to Kropotkin's *Mutual Aid*, though he did not present it as a matter of loyalty.

With the development of language, as a set of semantic substitutes for situations, actions, and relations, and thence as a means of projecting a vision of future situations to be achieved and actions to be performed, first socially and then personally, loyalty took on a definitely and rationally temporal dimension. But because of the narrowly local dimensions of the early group, the loyalty thus exhibited was but that of the pack. With the rise of intra-group interests, first, of familial prestige and security—priestly and dynastic, and thence of occupational and possessive interests, as of crafts, professions, capitalists, and entrepreneurs, we find a development of conflicting intra-group loyalties that were more or less inimical to the life economy of the group as a whole and to the loyalties necessary for its support. The basis of all these loyalties was an interest in security, current and future, as far ahead as the local or functional group was able to contemplate a future.

As just implied, among the earliest of these intra-group or functional-group interests to emerge were the priestly and dynastic. In the interest of their own security, often at the expense of the actual security of the total group, these two particularist groups have been much addicted to demanding that the first loyalty of the group as a whole be centered upon them. Then, in order to make more sure their own security, these institutional groups

reached down and assumed control of education. They thus sought to orient and channel the interests and energies of the on-coming generation in ways calculated to subserve the interests and security of themselves as its self-constituted masters.

With the popular displacement of these authoritarian agencies, whether by oligarchies or by democratically selected agencies, the dominant intra-group center of the loyalty demand was broadened at the base. And so was the education that these new agencies demanded and more or less successfully enforced. And now, other functional groups, seeking to use this central governing agency as an instrument of envisioned ways for their own security, demand from it a loyalty to their interests, and thence demand a loyalty of the entire group to this more or less willing agency of their hopes. Here is where we find ourselves today, both politically and religiously.

"Government," which was at first a figure of thought appropriated from the seafaring life, and which thus meant "piloting," has retained, even in democratic and republican countries, the authoritarian-power connotation of mastership and ownership, that it acquired in a monarchical age. Instead of serving as an impartial moderator of intra-group interests, in the interest of the life economy of the group as a whole, government tends to lend or sell itself out to such sub-groups as are best organized for bringing pressure to bear upon it for the protection and promotion of their own interests. In such a condition of affairs, the less articulate—the great mass of economic producers and consumers, the massive base of support of the general life economy—are made the victim of agencies seeking their own myopic security, even at the expense of the life economy as a whole. What we call "government" has not yet learned its proper function of scientific, technological arbitrator and adjuster of all the interests of the group life, relative to a healthy life economy of the group as a whole. Neither has it yet learned that one of its chief functions is that of an educative piloting of the whole, so that all these varied interests may become fused into one bionomic interest, to which all its individuated members should be subservient and instrumental. Nor will such a consummation ever be achieved, until our scientists and scientific educators themselves discern clearly the function

of their own work, relative to a life economy, not merely of their own national groups, but of the species as a whole.

Thus far I have been speaking mostly within the terms of a nationalistic space-time frame of reference. But the very universality of science should make it reasonably easy for us to transcend so spatially narrow a frame. It should force us to expand this frame into one broad enough to include all contemporary humanity of any given generation, and to extend it temporally, to include all humanity that may yet possibly live upon our earth.

Well, then, where does the major loyalty of our group come into the picture? Our properly first loyalty is owed to our species as a whole, as we conceive of this as an earth-wide process moving ever forward along the future segment of the time axis of our reference frame. We who are here should thus recognize the constitutive and functional membership, within the species life, of every race, empire, nation, province, functional group, and individual person. And so should we help, educationally, all these other constituent species members so to do.

Thus we as persons and as a group should be able to declare: "My first loyalty is a loyalty to my species. I owe and acknowledge a loyalty to my race, nation, government, political party, religious institution, profession, and to my fellows as persons, only in so far as these, at least in my hopes of them, are loyal to the species life. In my work as an educator, my first immediate loyalty is owed to my students, as developing members of the species life. I owe a loyalty to the administrative agency of my school, only in so far as it apparently proves itself a loyal agency of the species life; and it owes me a loyalty, only in the same degree. It owes me a loyalty, in my loyal devotion to my students as developing members of the species and potential promoters of its life economy; I owe it a loyalty, in return for its support of my efforts and for its other services, direct and indirect, to those I seek to serve." I well recognize that these things are more easily said than done, but such is the spirit in which the work of education should be carried on. Who can deny, or even doubt it?

Now it may well be that, as men learn to take such a view of life and education, there will still be room for differences of opinion regarding the newer ends of effort and the ways of attaining them.

There will still be room for rival political parties, religious sects, schools of educational theory and practice, and the like. But surely, each of such competing functional groups, each now self-consciously a rival in service to the species life, will be able to respect its competitors; their very rivalries will be of suggestive benefit to each other and hence will redound to the service of the species life. And finally, only as such groups can justify their existence in terms of positive service in the life economy of the species can they earn their right to exist. This is the final criterion which our own group must meet, in justification of its existence.

Like that of the sea-going ship, the function of government, the piloting agency of the "ship of state," is that of directing, guidance, or leadership. It is not that of drivership or compulsion, save in cases of poor personal or institutional orientation, or ineptness, or insanity. And even where compulsion must be resorted to, it should be so exercised as persuasively to win the wayward member to a sounder orientation and a more willing and enthusiastic participation in the life enterprise as a whole.

We have long been hearing much controversy over the forms of governmental agencies, and political loyalties are today being demanded in the name of such forms. This is surely a silly performance for supposedly rational beings to stage. In affairs rational, desired function determines form. If a government, of whatever form, should once discern and set about the performance of its proper function in the life economy of its own group and of the species as a whole, it would incidentally change its form, in the interest of improving its function. And as those it served came to a better appreciation of its improved function, they would accord it both aesthetic appreciation and enthusiastic loyalty. In affairs human, it is function, not form, that is the criterion of worth. "Handsome is, that handsome does," is as true of nations and institutions as of persons. Moreover, self-conscious particularity can not successfully withstand the prior and larger claims of universality.

III

The problem of academic freedom can now be dismissed with but a brief discussion. First of all, there is the need of the sci-

tific attitude, as the primal basis upon which academic freedom can even be rationally demanded. I have already discussed the ingredients of this attitude: a critical care regarding the postulates underlying the educator's rational processes, and the objectives motivating and directing them; a similar care in the isolation, observation, and description of his individual facts; and, in cases of generalizations, such a sampling of facts as thoroughly to justify them. When the educator has taken these precautions, he is in a position to let his facts speak for themselves, in ways for which he can hardly be held responsible—ways which may well serve to forestall criticism of him as their mouthpiece.

But perhaps the greatest menace to academic freedom is an authoritarian attitude on the part of the teacher himself—as if it were his function to tell his students what to believe. Contrary to any such notion, it is his function to help his students to understand. "Understanding is the beginning of wisdom." We can neither believe nor disbelieve, intelligently, unless we first understand. We understand many human beliefs, without ourselves believing them. Our belief about any given fact or set of facts is merely our clearest and best understanding of them—or our clearest verbalization about them. If we give our attention to understanding, beliefs can be left to take care of themselves, in their own sweet way.

If the teacher will but conduct his verbal instruction upon the level of understanding, he will feel free to acknowledge his own possible limitations. Moreover, in exhibiting such frankness about his own limitations, he at the same time assures his students of their proper right to freedom—granted the requisite interest in the search for the facts upon which their understanding must rest. The teacher who thus accords to his students a freedom equal to that which he demands for himself is not likely to be reported as transgressing the limitations of a legitimate freedom.

It will be noted that I am insisting upon a high degree of candor on the part of the teacher. I believe his students are entitled to know how he stands upon every question relevant to the course in progress. I have no use for the academic tight-rope walker, balancing this against that, and unable either to come to some at least tentative conclusion himself or to help his students to do so—

perhaps because of fear of social consequences. When he frankly declares himself, with a proper admission of his limitations and of the tentativeness of his statements, he by that action affords his students "something to shoot at," whether by way of accepting and of seeking further support for his conclusions or by way of proceeding to disprove his conclusions and supplant them with truer ones. In this way, he promotes the intellectual growth of his students, even beyond his own stature—"a consummation devoutly to be desired."

Nor, in this connection, do I fear that dread word "propaganda." Our best assured knowledges and our best confirmed techniques must be propagated by education, from generation to generation. They are always things to be propagated—are always "propaganda," in the proper figurative sense of this word. "Propaganda," as generally used, is but a "smear" word, a sentimental or emotionalized gesture calculated to condemn what the fearful do not like. If men took care to comprehend its real objective denotation, they would be forced to find some other word with which to "smear" their opponents.

And so with the words "democracy," "fascism," and "communism." Men use the word "democracy" to "gild" their own position, which may be quite undemocratic, and "fascism" and "communism" to "smear" those whose actions or inferred intentions they do not like, even though these may be far from deserving the name. Gilding and smearing—both are unworthy the holder of an academic position, who should both exhibit on his own part and inculcate in his students a care for the precise denotative sense of the words that they use. The academic man who carries on in the spirit I have indicated may become the object of such smearing, but he can stand forth in all innocence of heart as neither deserving the smearing nor in any need of gilding. If our denotative words—nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and relation words—constitute semantic substitutes for their references, as I hold they properly do, then their use calls for a greater degree of specificity than our employment of them generally exhibits.

Finally, the very foundation of a humanly legitimate claim for loyalty, and for academic freedom in education, is a sincere, healthy, and ardent concern for humanity, in all its space-time,

present and future reality, as one of the organic species. The deep-rooted, sturdy banyan tree of universal humanism is the trunk from which all humanly legitimate "isms" branch forth in the social field, and there may be many of them. Contrary to American Legion-ism, D. A. R.-ism, U. S. Chamber of Commerce-ism, Liberty League-ism, which declare that they would eliminate all isms—thereby sawing off the limbs upon which they themselves sit—there is a legitimate place for isms, parties, or sects, provided they branch forth from this concern that I have called universal humanism. Here we are to find the basic ground for all our legitimate educational loyalties and for our claims to academic freedom; for here is to be found at once the true breadth and direction, and the proper motivation, for all our social interests, including the educational.

PLANNING A UNIVERSITY'S FUTURE

By J. ALTON BURDINE

The University of Texas

The survey or investigation of an established institution by an outside group for the management is essentially a democratic procedure. Such an investigation may be confined to a limited phase of an institution's work, or it may be of a general and unlimited character. Moreover, it may be conducted either by specially designated individuals unconnected with the particular institution or by persons who are themselves members of the organization. The former method is well known within the realm of government, for the legislative investigating committee has become a standard procedure for evaluating certain aspects of American governmental administration. The latter method, however, is the usual one for surveying the organization, procedure, and work of American higher educational institutions. For this purpose such a method is especially appropriate, since it accords with the theoretically democratic spirit of educational administration. As an ideal it subjects the activities and leadership of the directorate to critical appraisal by a group chosen from an interested and intelligent community of "equals."

The desirability of a general survey of the organization, procedures, and policies of any social institution at periodic intervals is apparent, if the assumption may be indulged that those institutions are most useful that are readily adapted to a world in which the conditions and demands of life are ceaselessly changing. The accepted rôle of universities in social organization requires that these institutions, if their ultimate function is to be realized, adjust themselves quickly and easily to this changing scene. Whether by outside pressure or by internal foresight, a university must grow, and its structural, procedural, and functional growth should parallel the development and enlargement of its responsibility to the community.

Like other institutions, however, the processes and functions of universities tend to become traditional and constitutionalized, and change in them is then very difficult to effect. Like administrators in other fields, university officialdom tends to develop a belief in the inviolability of the customary rules and procedures and to look upon suggestions of major changes with considerable misgivings. In such a situation the laity—both faculty and student body—tends to accept the *status quo* with that mingled feeling of happiness and regret that comes from resignation to the inevitable. It is at this point that a sympathetic yet critical evaluation of the operations of an institution is most desirable.

The relationships that are peculiar to university organization make "self-criticism" the most logical method of adapting universities as social institutions to changing conditions. Such criticism is likely to be more sympathetic, more intelligent, and more responsible than that which is directed from the outside. In the university community, furthermore, that degree of intelligence is presumed which invites self-criticism and self-adjustment. Yet in this method certain great difficulties inhere. The recent experience of The University of Texas with a general survey conducted by an elective faculty committee may throw some light upon the problems raised in this introduction.

I

In January, 1936, the General Faculty of The University of Texas¹ adopted a resolution authorizing the selection of a Special Committee on Organization, Functions, and Future of the University. This resolution, presented by the Dean of the Graduate School, contained two interesting provisions. First, the Committee was to be composed "exclusively of members of the Faculty whose ranks are below the rank of full professor;" and secondly, its size and membership were to be determined by the President,

¹ The General Faculty is composed of over three hundred voting members, including teachers and administrative officials. It holds six regular meetings each year. All policies adopted by the separate school or college faculties are subject to its approval. Its broad jurisdiction covers such matters as general educational policies, student life and activities, scholastic performance, and admission and graduation. Its authority is limited, however, by the reserved power of the Board of Regents and by the jurisdiction conferred upon administrative officers by the Board.

"on the basis of written nominations from the voting members of the General Faculty whose ranks are below the rank of full professor." The responsibility of the Committee, as outlined in the resolution, was to "study present trends in higher education" and to "formulate and present" to the General Faculty "plans for the adaptation of this University to its future functions." In this manner a survey of a rapidly growing state-supported university was launched, to be conducted by a committee whose membership was likely to be inexperienced and generally unfamiliar with the large task assigned. Only in an atmosphere of friendliness could one expect such a committee to function with any degree of success.

Soon after the adoption of the resolution, the President requested each voting member of the General Faculty below the rank of full professor to make two nominations. When these were counted, eleven members were appointed to the Committee.¹ In February, 1936, the Committee began its arduous task and submitted a rather lengthy report to the Faculty approximately one year later. Its technique of investigation, though not unusual, may be of interest.

At the outset the Committee faced its most difficult problem—that of defining the scope of its study. The broad jurisdiction implicit in the resolution made necessary some drastic limitation, if the Committee were to avoid an endless "fishing expedition" involving fruitless labor and unpredictable results. On one side appeared the boundless field of educational policy for investigation; on the other, the intriguing field of administrative organization, procedures, and policies. Here were problems presented by a fast growing student body; there, were equally important problems affecting faculty performance and morale. It was assumed that there were some problems more pressing than others, but the question remained as to the points between which the line should be drawn.

¹ At the time of appointment, the Committee was composed of one instructor, six assistant professors, and four associate professors. Nine were from the College of Arts and Sciences and one each from the College of Engineering and the School of Business Administration. Of the nine chosen from the College of Arts and Sciences, three were from the Department of English, two from the Department of Government, and one each from the Departments of Economics, Physics, Romance Languages, and Sociology. There were ten men and one woman on the Committee.

In order to determine the problems to be studied, the Committee invited every member of the Faculty to send in suggestions. The response to this request was encouraging, for some twenty per cent of the Faculty complied. Certainly the Committee was safe in assuming that these expressions were indicative of faculty thinking, perhaps generated over a period of years. Here were valuable ideas from a fair proportion of a large and rather cosmopolitan faculty. From this motley array of pet theories, well ordered plans, and personal grievances, a detailed outline of the problems to be considered was prepared.

The Committee recognized immediately that these problems could not be investigated satisfactorily in plenary session. Consequently, sub-committees of from three to five members were appointed, and a regular schedule of meetings was arranged. Through overlapping membership and progress reports made periodically to the full Committee, each sub-committee was kept informed of the work and ideas of the other groups. In this manner a certain unity of purpose was maintained. Where broad differences in approach were evident in the work of certain sub-committees, an agreement on general principles was effected in plenary session. By means of this procedure, sweeping revision of sub-committee reports later was unnecessary and a great saving in time resulted. The final Report contained the recommendations of the several sub-committees as modified by full committee consideration.

After several exploratory sessions of the Committee, in which agreement was reached upon certain fundamental assumptions, each sub-committee began its particular investigation. The problem of obtaining information as to the important matters under consideration was then faced. In meeting this problem, reliance was placed upon catalogues and descriptive material published by universities, both public and private; questionnaires sent to a representative list of such institutions, seeking information as to their approach to certain problems; interviews with certain administrative officers of the University, who demonstrated time and again their willingness to explain procedures and policies; and, finally, articles and reports in those journals that describe the procedures and policies of higher educational institutions.

Although the information relating to other educational insti-

tutions was valuable in broadening the Committee's outlook, the members felt, as stated in the Report, "that the problems which affect the University today are for the most part local in character, and that their solution must be proposed with due regard to the limitations, financial and otherwise, which are present locally. Although of some value as a guide, the success of a particular organization or procedure or function at some other university does not . . . guarantee its success at The University of Texas or even make its establishment desirable. A local problem must often be met by a local solution. Theoretical conclusions based upon the experiences of others may often prove invalid when tested by the facts of a local situation." By maintaining this point of view, the Committee sought to avoid the presentation of a Utopian scheme culled from the most successful practices of other institutions.

II

The Report of the Committee contained ten sections, each relating to an important problem. Of these, seven concerned the University as a whole, while three dealt with problems under the jurisdiction of particular colleges or schools. Of those matters relating to general University interest, major consideration was given to the problems of administrative organization and procedure, such matters affecting the teaching staff as appointments, promotions, dismissals, salaries and teaching load, and public relations. Few recommendations were made concerning specific educational policies and student life. This apparently unbalanced character of the Report needs a word of explanation, which must be made upon the basis of the fundamental assumptions, previously mentioned, which the Committee arrived at in its earlier sessions. These assumptions rendered a dual service: they gave to the Committee a point of view or approach, and they served to limit effectively the field of inquiry.

In a broad survey it is evident that agreement upon fundamentals is a condition precedent to effective committee action. To arrive at such agreement, however, is no easy task, especially in a committee whose method of selection assures a varied represen-

tation of opinion. After considerable discussion, the following assumptions, though never reduced to writing, were accepted as a basis for the Report: First, that the effectiveness of a university depends in great measure upon an efficient machinery for the formulation and execution of policies; a competent, interested, and responsible administrative personnel; and the careful selection and retention of a faculty possessing high professional qualifications. Second, that in any large institution where frequent personal contact between members of the organization and the directorate is impossible, there is need for definite procedures and stated policies in order to insure stable administration and to avoid arbitrary determinations. Third, that the lines of responsibility and control in the university hierarchy should be clearly defined and a proper balance struck between the authority of the operating units and the control of the central authorities. Finally, that in state-supported educational institutions particularly, where competition with other agencies for funds is often keen, considerable attention should be given to the development of a farsighted and intensive public relations program. Excepting a few specific proposals relating to educational policy and student life, the Committee devoted its major attention to recommendations which it believed were in keeping with the foregoing assumptions. The adoption of these recommendations, it was felt, would make easier the day-by-day solution of other problems which were not covered in the Report.

Upon the basis of these assumptions, certain major recommendations were advanced. The most important of these may be summarized as follows: First, the indirect participation of the Faculty, through representatives chosen from and by the group concerned and invested with advisory powers, in the selection of the President and the school and college Deans. Since the tenure of Deans is limited, it was proposed that the procedure for reappointment should be the same as that for an initial appointment. Second, in order to insure minority representation on such committees, election by a system of proportional representation was strongly recommended. Third, the creation of the position of Vice-President with clearly defined duties relating primarily to matters of internal administration. Under the direction of the

President, who would be concerned largely with external affairs, this official would perform important functions in the field of personnel administration. Fourth, the election by a system of proportional representation of five faculty members to the Administrative Council, which serves as the Executive Committee of the General Faculty and as an advisory agent to the President.¹ Fifth, reinvigoration of the broad supervisory powers conferred on Deans by relieving them of routine duties which now occupy much of their time. Sixth, the institution of a more responsible and integrated departmental organization through the substitution of the single head for the present budget council. This council, composed of the full professors of the department, is the chief budgetary and appointing authority. Seventh, definite procedures and principles relating to appointments to the teaching staff, promotions, rating of teachers, salary increases, tenure, and dismissal. Lastly, the establishment of effective public relations machinery and the formulation of definite public relations policies.

III

The submission of the Report created considerable interest. From March, 1937, through February, 1938, the General Faculty debated those sections of the Report which concerned the University as a whole. Although charges of "inexperience," "incompetency," and "youthful enthusiasm" were now and then hurled at the Committee, surprising support was given not only by the lower faculty ranks but also by many of the "older" professors and by some administrative officials. In faculty deliberations both young and old voted, but the older members more freely expressed their opinions. Amendments, some submitted by the Committee and others by individuals, modified certain proposals, but only one major recommendation—that relating to the departmental headship—was defeated after lengthy debate. This proposal was by far the most controversial of all those submitted. After this defeat, however, the Committee succeeded in

¹ This Council is composed of the chief administrative officers and, according to the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Regents, three faculty members appointed by the President. For several years no faculty appointments were made, but recently the practice of appointing such members was revived.

effecting a compromise between its original recommendation and the present system of departmental organization.

When the General Faculty completed its action on the Report, its recommendations were then ready for submission by the President to the Board of Regents. Those sections relating to administrative organization and procedure and public relations, adopted by the General Faculty in the spring of 1937, were presented to the Board during the following summer and, in turn, were referred by the Board to the Administrative Council for comment and study. The remaining sections of the Report upon which the General Faculty later took action are now in the process of submission to the Board. It is probable that these sections will also be referred to the Administrative Council for its consideration. The search for a President, occasioned by the death of President H. Y. Benedict in the spring of 1937, has unfortunately delayed Regental consideration of the recommendations of the Faculty in these matters. Whether such delay will be fatal to the changes proposed is a matter of future interest.

To what extent the Report has been influential is difficult to determine. In the bill making appropriations to the University for the present biennium, which was passed in May, 1937, there is a provision authorizing the appointment of a Vice-President at a salary not to exceed eighty per cent of the President's compensation. As yet this position has not been filled. Of even more interest, however, was Regental authorization of the selection of an elective faculty advisory committee, as recommended in the Report, when the search for a President was instituted. In the opinion of the writer, this committee, selected in July, 1937, and with half of its membership chosen by a system of proportional representation,¹ has rendered a most valuable service to the Board. Furthermore, the belief of the Committee that a system of proportional representation would insure a membership of a broadly representative character was amply justified by the results of this election.

Whether Regental action on the recommendations of the General Faculty relating to the Report will be favorable or not is a

¹ Six members were chosen by the six major schools and colleges—one by each school or college—and six members were elected at large.

question yet unanswered. Much will depend upon the attitude of the one who is selected as President. Regardless of the outcome, however, the problems considered by the Committee are those which, it is believed, are most important in shaping a university's future. Details of educational policy, matters affecting student life, and other problems are subject to proper study and adjustment if the machinery of university administration is properly oiled and manned and if the faculty is competent, interested, and possessed of a high morale. Although proper organization, definite procedures, clearly defined lines of responsibility and control, and stated policies are essential tools of effective administration, in the final analysis the adaptability of an institution to new situations depends upon the personnel charged with the formulation and execution of policies. What that wise founder of Pennsylvania, William Penn, said of governments is equally appropriate to universities: "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined too." In institutions of higher education, the faculty must share with administrators this responsibility in proportion to its influence in the determination and execution of policies; but the opportunity for effective leadership belongs almost wholly to administrators alone.

THE COLLEGE PROFESSOR AND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

By CLAIR WILCOX

Swarthmore College

Employees of non-profit religious, educational, and charitable institutions are specifically excluded from coverage under the old age and unemployment insurance systems set up by the Federal Social Security Act in 1935. The Advisory Council on Social Security and the Social Security Board have both recommended to Congress that the old age insurance plan be extended to include these groups. The Board has also recommended extension of the unemployment insurance program. These recommendations have the support of the President. If enacted into law they would bring professors in private colleges and universities within the scope of the social insurance systems. Many church bodies have actively opposed these proposals. The Association of American Colleges has indicated its willingness to accept extension of old age insurance but is opposed to the taxation of educational institutions to finance insurance against unemployment. On March 17, 1939, the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives voted unanimously against the recommended extension. This, however, does not close the question. Action may still be taken at the present session of Congress and, failing this, the recommendations are certain to be repeated at the following session. It is necessary, therefore, to consider how extension of the Act to college and university faculties would affect the interests of their members.

As it now stands, the old age insurance plan imposes taxes on wages and payrolls at the rate of $1\frac{1}{2}\%$ each in 1940, 1941, and 1942, 2% each in 1943, 1944, and 1945, $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ each in 1946, 1947, and 1948, and 3% each in 1949 and thereafter. These taxes apply only to that part of any salary that falls below \$3000 in any year. These tax rates may be modified by further legisla-

tion. The law provides for three types of payments. Monthly annuities of not less than \$10 and not more than \$85 will be paid upon retirement at 65 or later to persons who have made contributions for five years or more. The size of an annuity within these limits will be computed, on the basis of the total salary (up to \$3000 in any year) received during the period when contributions were made, at the following rates: $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% of the first \$3000 of total salary, $\frac{1}{12}$ of 1% of the next \$42,000, and $\frac{1}{24}$ of 1% of everything above \$45,000. Typical monthly annuities, on the basis of an annual salary of \$3000, would be: \$25 for persons covered from age 60 to age 65, \$50 for those covered from 50 to 65, \$62.50 for those covered from 40 to 65, and \$75 for those covered from 30 to 65. Death benefits, at the rate of $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ of the total salary (up to \$3000 in any year) received during the period of coverage, will be paid to the beneficiaries of those who die before collecting annuities. Death benefits at age 65 in the cases just given would amount to \$525, \$1575, \$2625, and \$3675, respectively. Death benefits computed at the same rate minus all annuities received will be paid to the beneficiaries of those who die after collecting annuities. Death benefits will have been exhausted by annuity payments by the attainment of age 70. Refunds computed at the same rate will be paid at age 65 to those who were not covered for a period long enough to make them eligible for benefits. These refunds simply return to men who were over 60 when brought under the plan the payments made by and for them plus an additional sum in lieu of interest. It is likely that the benefit, as well as the tax, provisions of the law will be altered. This, however, is the present system. How would its extension to faculty members affect their interests?

Four cases must be distinguished: first, that of the state or municipal institution; second, that of the private institution that now has no retirement plan; third, that of the private institution whose retirement plan covers only a part of its personnel; and fourth, that of the private institution whose retirement plan gives complete coverage.

The recommended extension of the Act would not apply to professors in city and state colleges and universities. The law specifically excludes from coverage the employees of state and

local governments and instrumentalities thereof. It is possible that the constitutional obstacle that has prevented the taxation of these groups may be surmounted. In the meantime, some public institutions will continue their present retirement plans; others, now without plans, may be led by the extension of the Social Security Act voluntarily to establish them; still others will fail to afford their professors the protection that is provided elsewhere.

Three-fourths of our private institutions now make no provision for retirement. More than half of the professors in such institutions are in those that lack retirement plans. Extension of the Act would provide these teachers with sorely needed protection against old age. Schools that are in a sound financial position should be able to assume the burden imposed by the payroll tax without great difficulty. Schools that are already in financial straits might find it hard to bear. It might be necessary, in some cases, to cut salaries in order to obtain the money with which to pay the tax. But even here the need for retirement income exists. And the teacher would find that the money paid to the government would buy him more protection than he could purchase elsewhere at the price. The proposed extension of the Act appears clearly to be in the interest of professors in these institutions.

Among those private colleges and universities that already have retirement plans, coverage is seldom complete. Non-teaching employees, one-third of the entire personnel, are rarely afforded protection. Participation by faculty members is usually voluntary and therefore partial. Extension of the Act would compel such institutions to make contributions toward the retirement of all their employees. The measure would affect different professors in different ways. Suppose, for example, that a college has a total payroll (in salaries below \$3000) of \$1,000,000 and that it now contributes 5% to the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association on \$300,000 of this. Its annual expenditure for this purpose amounts to \$15,000. If it were brought under the old age insurance system its tax on the whole payroll would start at \$15,000 and rise gradually to \$30,000. Continued payment of 5% on the \$300,000 covered by TIAA contracts (part of it now going to the government and the remaining part to the TIAA) plus payment at the prevailing tax rate on the \$700,000 previously

not covered would substantially increase the total expenditure for retirement. If the college were financially able to assume this burden, professors holding TIAA contracts would lose nothing while professors and other employees who were formerly without protection would now obtain it. If, however, the college were unable to assume the burden, it would be forced to pay its taxes and discontinue its contributions to the TIAA. Here, again, those who previously lacked protection would obtain it. But the professors who held TIAA contracts would suffer. The college would now contribute only $1\frac{1}{2}\%$, 2%, $2\frac{1}{2}\%$, and 3% toward their retirement instead of the 5% that they had expected and the annuities due them would be smaller than those on which they had planned. Their preferred position among the employees of the college would be abolished. It is possible, then, that extension of the Act to such institutions might operate, in some cases, to help the majority and harm a minority of their employees.

Those private institutions whose retirement plans already cover their entire personnel might adapt themselves to the extension of the Act in one of three ways. (It will be assumed in each of the following illustrations that the college and the teacher each now contributes 5% of the amount of his annual salary to the TIAA.) First: the college might discontinue its contribution to the TIAA and pay only its tax to the government; or it might arbitrarily reduce its contribution to the TIAA by something more than the amount of the tax. In either case rights established by previous contributions would be unimpaired and the professor, if he were willing to pay for a larger part of it himself, would still be able to purchase from the TIAA an annuity as large as that on which he had planned. But such action would not be fair to him. It would cut the contribution made by the college toward retirement and it would leave the professor with less protection than he had been led to expect. Second: the college might continue its contribution to the TIAA and pay the tax as well; or it might reduce its contribution to the TIAA by something less than the amount of the tax. In either case the college would spend more on retirement and the teacher would obtain additional protection. Where salaries are low, the larger contribution would purchase a more nearly adequate retirement income. But here added expenditures,

if possible at all, might as well be devoted to improving the salary scale. Where salaries are high, combined contributions in excess of 10% would purchase annuities larger than those needed for comfortable retirement and would divert a larger part of the budget to this purpose than could be justified. Each of these alternatives, therefore, must be rejected; one remains: the college might undertake so to articulate its contributions to the government and to the TIAA as to leave either its total expenditure or the prospective annuities of its employees at the figures which obtained before the extension of the Act. Each of these possibilities will be examined in turn.

The simplest arrangement would be one by which the college would continue to contribute 5% to the TIAA on the part of any salary that exceeded \$3000 and would reduce its contribution to the TIAA on the taxable \$3000 of any salary by the exact amount of the tax, paying the TIAA and the government, respectively, 3½% and 1½% for three years, 3% and 2% for three years, 2½% and 2½% for three years, and 2% and 3% thereafter. The college budget would be unaffected by the change. Rights purchased with contributions on salary in excess of \$3000 would not be altered. The professor would be able to continue total payments to the TIAA at the former rate if he chose to pay the difference himself. Let us assume, however, that his own contributions would be the same as those made by the college, their combined payments amounting to 10% of his salary each year. How would this arrangement affect the size of his prospective annuity? In almost every case it would be larger than the one that he could have obtained from the TIAA alone. Let us take three examples. In each case we shall assume that a man comes under the TIAA retirement plan at age 30, that he comes under the government plan on January 1, 1940, that contributions are made to the TIAA alone before that date and are made at the same combined rate to the TIAA and the government thereafter, that the man receives \$3000 a year for 35 years and retires at age 65. A man who is 30 on January 1, 1940, retiring in 1975, would collect \$116.57 a month under the TIAA plan alone, \$129.84 a month if the combined TIAA and government plans were substituted for it. A man who is 40 in 1940, retiring in 1965, would collect

\$172.25 from the TIAA alone and \$183.97 from the combined plans. A man who is 50 in 1940, retiring in 1955, would collect \$212.77 from TIAA alone, \$236.09 from the combined plans. The larger sums payable to the older men are attributable to two facts: the TIAA annuities were formerly computed on a more generous scale than is possible today and the government annuities are deliberately computed on the basis of a formula which favors those who were older at the time when the plan was adopted. But each age group gets more when the TIAA and the government plans are combined than it would have obtained from the TIAA alone. The proposed extension of the Social Security Act would, in general, serve the interest of those who teach in private institutions whose present retirement plans cover all of their employees.

To this generalization certain exceptions must be made. A teacher who came under the combined plan before he was 25 and received a salary of \$3000 for more than 40 years might get a somewhat smaller annuity on retirement than he would have obtained from the TIAA alone. Taxes paid by and for men over 60 would not entitle them to receive an annuity from the government. They would receive, instead, a refund of $3\frac{1}{2}\%$ on salaries up to \$3000 paid them until age 65. Taxes paid on a \$3000 salary by and for a man 61 would amount at 65 to \$390; his refund would be \$420. He would get a few dollars less than he might have enjoyed if this money had gone toward the purchase of a TIAA annuity. Men over 62, however, should better than break even. These are exceptional cases. More serious is the fact that substitution of the government plan for part of the TIAA plan would reduce the amounts payable to the beneficiaries of those who die before collecting annuities. Death benefits under the TIAA plan return all contributions made by the professor and by the college plus compound interest. Death benefits under the government plan fall far below the combined tax payments of employee and employer as the tax rates rise. As the law stands, the advantage of the larger annuities which it promises is offset, in part, by the disadvantage of the smaller death benefits which it would pay.

Comparison of the relative advantages of the TIAA plan and the government plan must be modified, however, in the light of proposals made by the Advisory Council, the Social Security

Board, and the Secretary of the Treasury for amendment of the benefit and tax provisions of the Act. The proposed changes in the benefit provisions would make the government plan more attractive to older men and to married men and less so to younger men who remain single. Annuities would be paid after three, instead of five, years of contributions. They would be computed on the basis of an average, rather than an accumulated, wage formula. Supplementary annuities would also be paid, after age 65, to the wives of insured men. Each of these provisions would make possible the payment of larger sums to older men. Thus a man who worked from 60 to 65 for \$1200 a year would receive, upon retirement, not the \$17.50 annuity promised by the present law, but \$26.25 a month if he were single and \$39.38 a month if he were married. Lump-sum death benefits would be radically reduced. In their stead the government would set up a system of survivorship insurance. Widows and orphans of insured men would receive monthly allowances until the youngest orphan attained the age of 18. Widows aged 65 would collect monthly annuities for life. This change would afford the dependents of married men a greater measure of protection than the law now gives them. The cost of the added payments would be met by reducing not only the death benefits due to the heirs of single men but also the monthly annuities payable to single men in the later years of the plan. Under the present schedule, a man who worked 40 years for \$2400 a year could retire at 65, whether married or single, on \$81.25 a month. Under the proposed schedule, he would receive \$84 if married and only \$56 if single. Partial substitution of the government plan for the TIAA plan might thus impair the interest of young professors who fail to marry. This effect might be offset, however, by other changes. The old age insurance plan may be amended in time to cover permanent total disability. It would be in the interest of all teachers to avail themselves of this type of protection. It is likely, moreover, that the tax provisions of the Act will be amended to postpone or even to prevent the application of the higher rates. The lower the taxes and the larger the sum that can be paid, instead, to the TIAA, the larger the benefits that can be purchased with each dollar contributed under the combined plans. It is probable,

finally, that a large part of the benefits paid in later years will be frankly financed through general taxation. If the professor is to contribute to the system when he pays his income tax, it seems desirable that he should also participate in its benefits. Whatever the changes made in the law, it will probably be to the interest of an overwhelming majority of college and university professors to be included within its coverage.

A private institution whose present retirement plan covers its entire personnel, if brought under the Act, might attempt to articulate the two plans, not by reducing its contributions to the TIAA by the exact amount of the tax, as was assumed in the cases considered above, but by making payments to the TIAA large enough, together with those made by its employees, to purchase for each of them the same total benefits that he would have received from the TIAA alone. The latter arrangement might cost the college less money, on balance, than the former. It could not be worked out in detail, of course, until the nature of the amended benefit provisions of the Act was known. Even then precise articulation of the two plans would be difficult to achieve. It would be necessary to make payments at different rates for men and women, for older men and younger men, for married men and single men, and to adjust the rate of payment to every change in marital status and in the provisions of the law. It would be costly for the college to make the necessary computations. It might be difficult even for college professors to understand them. This arrangement, although it would have the advantage of preserving all existing rights, must be rejected on the grounds of lack of administrative feasibility. It would be simpler both for the college and for the professor to continue contributing to the combined plans at the present rate. The benefits payable to a small minority of professors might fall. Those accruing to the great majority would rise.

Extension of the old age insurance plan to colleges and universities is, on the whole, to be desired. Extension of unemployment insurance is another matter. State and Federal governments would immediately impose upon the payrolls of these institutions a 3% tax. This, added to the 1½% tax imposed for insurance against old age, would involve a burden three times as heavy

as that required to provide for retirement alone. Many a small college, financially weak but educationally useful, would find the tax beyond its capacity to pay. Unable to shift it forward to students by raising tuition fees, it would be compelled to shift it backward to the faculty by cutting salaries. Many an institution might be forced by the added pressure of the unemployment tax to discontinue its present retirement plan, leaving its professors with the less adequate protection afforded by the government plan when it stands alone. Institutions in a strong financial position could pay the tax without cutting salaries or impairing retirement rights, but even they would be compelled to curtail useful activities. The obligation would everywhere be an unwelcome one.

In some cases, to be sure, the burden might be lightened in the course of time. In those states whose unemployment insurance laws provide for merit rating, relative stability of employment might reduce the rate of the tax imposed on colleges and universities. But many of the laws make no provision for merit rating. And many of the laws that permit it include safeguards which may operate to prevent the reduction of tax rates. Where such safeguards are lacking, the rates will fall. But the protection afforded insured workmen will suffer accordingly. The law that would give educational institutions the lowest tax rate would be the one that would most seriously threaten the adequacy of the insurance fund. It would be unfortunate indeed if colleges and universities were to be placed in a position where they would find it to their interest to join with other employers in petitioning the state legislatures so to amend the unemployment insurance laws as to lessen the protection that they were designed to afford.

The sacrifices necessitated by extension of the unemployment insurance system to educational institutions would not purchase comparable benefits. College and university employment is relatively stable. Professors who are dropped on the first of June usually receive salary for another three or four months, an amount larger than, and a period as long as, that provided by the insurance laws. Unemployment benefits, up to \$15 weekly, might be collected for another three or four months. The teacher who found another position in September would neither need nor receive

them. The one who failed to do so would need to be supported, not for three or four months, but for an entire year. Such support is sometimes provided. Teachers are dismissed with a year's leave on pay, an expensive procedure, but one that occurs so infrequently that its general adoption would cost educational institutions far less than the regular unemployment tax. Professors thus have little need for unemployment insurance. It may be otherwise with non-teaching employees. Some of these workers have steady employment; others may regularly be hired in September and fired in May. Some of these people just as regularly dovetail summer jobs with their winter work. They do not need unemployment benefits and would not collect them. Others, however, may find no work to do during the summer months. If the state law is so written as to exclude seasonal unemployment, they will collect no benefits. If the law includes seasonal unemployment, they will, in effect, go on half pay every summer. This is the one group that stands to gain by the extension of unemployment insurance to the colleges and universities. It is possible that many institutions do not now discharge their obligation to these people. But this could certainly be done more cheaply, by spreading work more evenly over the year, by finding summer jobs for such employees, by paying other workers, as well as professors, an annual wage, than by coming in under the insurance system. Extension of unemployment insurance to educational institutions is quite clearly opposed to the interest of a majority of their employees.

A distinction must be drawn here between the proposals with reference to old age and to unemployment. Extension of old age insurance to private colleges and universities would assist them in fulfilling an obligation to their own employees which many of them have already recognized and which it would be in the interest of all of them to assume. Extension of unemployment insurance to such institutions would divert money from educational purposes to the payment of benefits to unemployed workers in industry and trade. It has been suggested that the imposition of any tax on the payrolls of educational institutions may prove to be an entering wedge which will ultimately destroy the privilege of tax exemption. This threat need occasion no serious concern. The levy

on payrolls is to be regarded as a contribution rather than a tax. Its proceeds finance specific benefits; they do not enter into the general revenue. The proposal to extend old age insurance offers benefits which justify the payment of the tax. The proposal to extend unemployment insurance does not. The two proposals are linked in the recommendations made by the Social Security Board. But it is not necessary that they stand or fall together. College and university professors, in their own interest and in the interest of the institutions which they serve, should support the one and oppose the other.

THE FACULTY AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION¹

By FRANKLYN SNYDER

Northwestern University

The assumptions underlying what I have to say on this subject, Mr. Chairman, are that we are interested in situations which exist today or may exist tomorrow; and that the question before us this afternoon is not what rôles have faculties played in university administration in by-gone days, but rather what rôles are they playing today, and what modifications of these rôles might conceivably benefit higher education. Hence I shall touch upon the past only casually, and shall pay most heed to the present.²

My own faculty experience has been acquired in a university composed of many schools. For that reason some of my comments may seem irrelevant so far as the typical independent college of liberal arts is concerned. But the basic problem of how to achieve the best relationship between faculty and administration is essentially the same at Northwestern University, where I am a member of the faculty, and at Beloit College, where for ten years I have had the pleasure of serving as a trustee. Hence I have tried to keep in mind certain phases of the problem which both university and college have in common, and to disregard others which are peculiar to only one of the two.

I have no delusion that I can solve even a small part of this problem, and beg you to believe that had I not been pressed into service by our executive secretary, I should have volunteered no opinion upon this somewhat controversial subject. But for thirty years I have had an unbelievably happy time as a member of our profession—twenty-five years of teaching English literature

¹ Delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Association at Chicago, Illinois, December 27, 1938.

² "Academical Patronage and Superintendence," by President James B. Conant. (*Occasional Pamphlets of the Graduate School of Education*, Harvard University, No. 3, June, 1938), is an illuminating discussion of the historical development of appointing methods in foreign universities and, to a slight extent, in the United States. The footnotes contain bibliographical references of great value.

to university students, three of trying to combine teaching with administration, and now two years of no teaching at all! During these three decades I have been acutely conscious of the faculty point of view in all university matters, and have never relinquished the belief, instilled in me long ago, that a college or university is great in proportion as its faculty is great; and further, that within its proper sphere the faculty should be supreme. It may conceivably be counted unto me for righteousness in this Association that I once organized a successful rebellion against what appeared, mistakenly perhaps, to be petty administrative tyranny on the part of a department head. (Because the rebellion succeeded, the group responsible for it was credited with constructive educational leadership; had it failed, we should have been condemned as uncooperative.) I have twice represented my faculty on formal committees of protest. The first waited on a newly elected president, and made certain comments on the salary scale; the second requested and received a hearing on the same matter before the trustees' budget committee. In company with many of my fellows I have heckled the deans and criticized the president, and have made, I fear, rather ungracious use of that untrammeled freedom of speech which is part of the established tradition on our campus. I recite these facts for no purpose except to indicate that I have gone through the mill, and that I speak to you today not, to be sure, as one having authority, but as one who has had the experiences which are part of normal faculty life, and which would qualify anyone to discuss the subject before us.

In one field, however, I am quite destitute of experience. I have never seen trustees, president, or dean in my own university carry out any coercive or repressive measures against an individual who had become unpopular because he had strayed from the beaten path of economic or political or religious orthodoxy. I have never seen a man refused reappointment or promotion because he differed from the administration on any matter, or had aroused the ire of the trustees through utterances made either on or off the campus. I have never seen academic freedom abridged or seriously threatened, nor have I seen appointments allowed to terminate without due regard for those underlying

conditions of tenure which this Association approves. Consequently, if our program committee had been interested in a discussion of administrative abuses in a university, I could have taken no part in it, for I have had no experiences which would in any way qualify me to serve as witness in such a case. But knowing as I do that this association is concerned only with a dispassionate consideration of the best way in which faculty and trustees, teachers and administrative officers, can work together toward the goal which they are all seeking, I am glad to share with you certain tentative ideas which have been shaping themselves in my mind during the past thirty years, but which I had never reduced to words until Mr. Himstead, in the exercise of his administrative prerogative, tyrannically compelled me to do so!

So much by way of perhaps unnecessary preliminary. And now, what can we say concerning the relation of the faculty to the university administration? By faculty I mean the body of men and women who are engaged in the happy and fruitful vocation—I can not call it a task—of teaching and research, whether divided among several schools as in a university, or united in one group as in a typical college of liberal arts. By administration I mean trustees or regents, who have legal responsibility for all the acts performed under their corporate authority, and the president, business manager, deans of various sorts, and chairmen of departments—the individuals whom the trustees hold responsible for the orderly functioning of the manifold activities maintained by the corporation. In dealing with this matter, I propose to discuss first the large question of the faculty's relation to the trustees, and then to touch briefly upon two smaller problems which from time to time arise to plague us, and which involve the faculty's relations to deans and departmental chairmen.

I

The large question I phrase in a highly exaggerated form, merely for the sake of making the major issue entirely clear: should the trustees determine what is to be done in the various educational areas covered by an institution, and direct the president to pass their orders on to the faculty through the various

links in the administrative chain till they finally reach Dr. X in his laboratory and Professor Y in his lecture room; or should the faculty decide what sort of activities an institution should maintain, and communicate its wishes to the president and trustees, who will thus have as their chief task the providing of funds necessary for making effective the will of the faculty?

An intelligent reply to such a query would be that neither of these alternatives offers the best solution for our problem. Rather should we say that a university or a college is much larger than the corporation which legally controls it or than the faculty which conducts the teaching and research, and that it will never grow to its full stature until both of these factors are given their proper values in the equation, and until the collective intelligence of the trustees and faculty and administrative officers—and sometimes of students and alumni as well—is focused upon the problems that inevitably present themselves.

At this point I digress for a moment to comment on the business man's understanding of educational problems, for we all know critics of the established order who grow somewhat derisive when it is suggested that trustees, business men with little experience in the actual practice of education, or regents elected by the voters of a state, can contribute anything of value to a solution of educational problems. What can a bank president or manufacturer know of classical philology and its place in a university curriculum? How can a politician whose name happens to appear on a party slate estimate the relative importance of, say, undergraduate personnel work and a program of educational broadcasting? How ridiculous it is, urge these critics, to assemble three or four ministers, half a dozen lawyers, a dozen business executives, all of necessity concerned with their own affairs and most of them many years removed from college or university experience—some, indeed, with no college experience of any sort—and expect them, by virtue of the fact that they are called trustees, even to understand the problems which an educational institution must solve! Critics who argue thus quote with approval a distinguished university president who said a year or two ago: "If of their own motion [trustees] take an educational problem in hand, they can decide rightly only by accident."

Well, the answer to such Jacobin objectors to allowing a lay board of trustees a voice in educational matters is simply the appeal to experience. You recall Dr. Johnson's reply when Boswell tried to involve him in a discussion of Berkeley's belief that reality is purely ideal: "I refute [Bishop Berkeley] thus," said the doctor, "striking his foot with mighty force against a large stone, till he rebounded from it." It may be quite wrong in theory to expect business men to understand even the more general sorts of educational problems; but experience shows that somehow or other they do, and that American colleges and universities, controlled and directed in large measure by men who are not in any technical sense educators, have made astonishing contributions to the welfare of society. Actually, it would not be difficult to show that boards of trustees composed of business men have occasionally been more astute in solving the educational than the financial problems of the institutions under their directions.

The moment one begins investigating the business man's competence in the educational world, one discovers interesting evidence on the matter. For example, the son of a Maryland tobacco planter, a lad who stopped all his formal education at the age of twelve, who apparently never traveled more than one hundred and fifty miles from his birthplace, who made a small fortune by trading groceries for whiskey and selling that whiskey under his own name as "Hopkins' Best," who added to that fortune by promoting one of our first railroads—this "uneducated" business man had an astonishing understanding of the educational needs of his native state. In 1869, he incorporated the Johns Hopkins University, and placed it in the guardianship of a board of trustees of his own choosing. When he died, in December of 1873, his will made munificent provision for its support and left it free to develop in what the future might show to be the most significant manner. That much of this future development was due to Daniel C. Gilman's educational genius, everyone knows; but it was the business man who saw the opportunity and made it possible for President Gilman and his faculty to do their great work.

Take another example. A New York farm lad, with just enough education to qualify him for admission to the bar, settled in the

little town of Port Washington, Wisconsin, to practice his profession. In 1852 he found himself burned out of home and office, and his library of law books in ashes. So, like other young men of that day, he took Horace Greeley's advice and went west. He sold miners' supplies, dabbled in California politics, and before long was directing the activities which led to the construction of the Southern Pacific railway—activities which even in the easy-going days of 1887 were pronounced "indefensible" by a governmental investigating commission. Tiring of the railroad and politics, he raised horses, and became as successful in the world of four-footed stock as he had been in that of railway shares. What more unlikely than that this man should have understood the significance of higher education, or should have created as a memorial to his son the great university which he built on his ranch of Palo Alto? Or again, coming nearer home, think for a moment about that son of an itinerant peddler of patent medicines, who used his uncanny skill at organization to gain control of an industry concerned with refining and marketing petroleum. How improbable that he should have understood the educational needs of the Mississippi Valley well enough to have established here in Chicago a university devoted to pure science, to research, and should have poured his millions into its treasury so generously and so wisely that the institution which he modestly refrained from naming after himself is today one of the world's great centers of learning.

The critic who objects that it is irrational to allow business men to control and direct educational institutions may have logic on his side. Theoretically, perhaps, Johns Hopkins and Leland Stanford and John D. Rockefeller should not have known enough to found the three universities which we associate with their names; but somehow or other they did, even though the tradition favoring such acts had not yet been established in America, and no lessening of income taxes resulted from their munificence. Moreover, as President Gilman pointed out, each of these men not only founded these institutions, but "indicated more or less definitely the conditions by which the administrations [should] be governed."¹ Furthermore, these three universities

¹ Gilman, D. C., *University Problems*, New York, 1898, p. 299.

have been and are now under the control of boards of trustees composed overwhelmingly of business men. So far as I can discover, no holder of a doctorate of philosophy, no "scholar" or "educator" in the conventional meaning of those terms, is a regular member of any of those boards today. In only one of the three does the president of the university have a Ph.D. degree. But quite obviously these boards of trustees have been and are possessed of enough wisdom to shape the educational destinies of their institutions to high and noble ends. Would the three universities have done more for society if their trustees had been scholars selected by the faculties? Personally, I doubt it. In the words of President Conant, "Companies of scholars have not made an enviable record in the matter of self-direction over a long period of years."¹

But the moment I have said this I hasten to add that the trustees of these institutions, like the trustees of many others that we could name, have been notably accessible to ideas, and have been eager to take counsel of the eminent men who have served as presidents and faculty members of the three universities. The trustees have defined the areas within which the universities were to operate and the general policies that were to be put into effect, but seem to have refrained from intermeddling with educational minutiae. And one unique service these and other lay trustees have been able to perform for their institutions—a service which the business man can perform better than the scholar. As the president of the board of trustees of one of our mid-western universities not long ago pointed out, they have interpreted the public to the universities, and thus have saved the universities from the sort of error which self-directed faculties might not have been wise enough to avoid.

But enough of this digression on the business man in education. If we are justified in judging by experience, an undeniably effective faculty-trustee relationship would seem to be that in which the trustees approve, and thus determine, general policies, but leave the faculty free to carry out these policies in what it believes to be the best way; and in which the collective wisdom of both

¹ Conant, James B.; *op. cit.*, p. 27.

faculty and trustees can be utilized in dealing with problems which neither group can solve by itself. In other words, the current will not flow in one direction only through the power line. It must flow in both directions at the same time, as the telegraph and telephone engineers send messages through a single strand of wire in both directions simultaneously.

Unless this current of ideas does actually move in both directions, neither trustees nor faculty will operate as effectively as they might. If either group considers itself competent to guide the university single-handed, the result will be mutual misunderstanding, unwarranted suspicion, and a regrettably inefficient performance. Wherever notably successful educational work is being carried on, you may be sure that trustees and faculty consider themselves as partners in an enterprise, and in no sense as opponents or even friendly rivals in a struggle for control. Each group will function primarily in its own area, as backfield and line must do in a football team; but each group will do all it can to understand and aid the other, and to exemplify in a large way the well-rounded team play that every football coach tries to develop.

The traditional link between the two groups, the accepted *liaison* officer is, of course, the president, who sits with both trustees and faculty, interprets each to the other, and must see to it that the current of ideas does actually flow in both directions. The power and responsibility resting on the president by virtue of this unique position are so great that when an institution attains unusual distinction the president properly receives the major share of the praise. Eliot, we say truthfully, made Harvard University; Gilman made Johns Hopkins; Harper built Chicago—though we know that each of these men had the aid of many brilliant assistants. It is always the captain of the ship to whom the Board of Trade presents the chief award, even though the third officer may have commanded the lifeboat which actually saved the crew of the derelict. Conversely, when things go wrong and success seems to loiter, it is the president who is dropped, as ruthlessly as the coach of a consistently unsuccessful football team, and with far less publicity. Who ever heard of discharging an entire faculty, or electing a whole new board of trustees, in order to

rehabilitate a mediocre university? No, it is much easier, and in some ways perhaps more appropriate, to look for a new president.

Now, granted that the man occupying the presidential seat of honor and danger—this veritable *siege périlleux*—is of the right stamp, I for one can not wish a better medium of regular and uninterrupted communication between trustees and faculty. The president might well arrange occasional meetings at which faculty and governing board discuss their common problems and learn to see things from the other's point of view. I have never known such sessions of the committee of the whole to be productive of ill, and I have heard of some that resulted in great good. I believe that when radical changes in an institution's educational policy are contemplated, such as, for example, the establishment of a new school or the discontinuing of one already in existence—indeed, in almost any strikingly unusual situation, a joint faculty and trustee committee on educational policies might well consider the problem. Certainly in the choice of a president the trustees should not disregard suggestions that might come from experienced members of the faculty. But when I find members of our Association urging that an elected committee of the faculty meet regularly with a similar group of trustees for the purpose of presenting faculty opinion directly to the trustees, I find myself inclined to dissent. It is conceivable, of course, that emergencies might arise in which it would be necessary for a faculty thus to side-track the president, and to deal directly with the governing board. But if such a procedure were resorted to except in emergencies, if it were to become standard practice, I fear that confusion instead of clarification of thinking would be the result. Almost inevitably the faculty would become engrossed in strictly business matters; as certainly the trustees would become involved with the details of purely educational problems. Before long the division of labor so essential to the successful operation of any large concern would disappear in what its proponents might call a "completely democratic type of university organization," but what in reality might be an inefficient debating society.

"Good fences," says Robert Frost in *Mending Wall*, "make good neighbors." Is it not as true in the university as on the farm? Will not the best sort of university organization recognize the

fact that trustees can not share with the faculty those responsibilities which by law they as trustees are required to bear, nor can the faculty transfer to the trustees those responsibilities which the common law of the educational world places upon the faculty? Each is in a sense a group of specialists, performing functions appropriate to it and to no one else. Each will make every attempt to understand the other; both will realize that the common task is larger than either group can perform alone. But to merge the two groups through frequent joint meetings of representative committees would, I believe, handicap both groups.

And so I return to the general question which I phrased so baldly at the opening of this paper. Wise trustees will not, they do not, give orders to a competent faculty except in general terms of educational policies which the trustees, as guardians of a public trust, believe should be put into operation. Wise faculties will not, they do not, undertake to estop the trustees from consideration of any but purely legal or financial problems. Neither of the alternatives I first proposed holds any great promise of success. As usual, the wise course would seem to be the middle one, the one which American institutions of distinction have pursued, and which I hope they will continue to pursue. You remember Edmund Burke's advice not rashly to throw over a system which actually works even though it may have some faults, in favor of an untried plan even though it may have much, in theory, to commend it. Well, in the long run, gentlemen, Burke will prove a better educational counsellor than his brilliant opponent Tom Paine.

II

In leaving this general phase of our problem and turning to certain specific details of faculty-administration relationship, I am aware that I have been presuming upon your good nature by discussing at some length and in rather platitudinous terms a matter in which the typical faculty member takes but little interest. Whether or not faculty and trustees exchange ideas only by way of the president is of slight concern to an instructor in English. He has his students, and all the treasures of our language and

literature awaiting his interpretation. Enough for him if he can lead those students into "the realms of gold," and occasionally, like the most famous of all grammarians, publish an article which shall

Settle *Hoti's* business, . . .
Give us the doctrine of the enclitic *De*.

What part the faculty should play in selecting a new president does not greatly worry the average research professor in his laboratory. He has his test-tubes and beakers; his materials for investigation are ready at hand; the unsolved problem is on his desk. His scientific curiosity, his insatiable desire to know, keeps him happily discontented till the answer reveals itself—and immediately that he has found it, he is off on another voyage of discovery. Let the reformers worry as they will about the trustees; he has life, liberty, and the right to pursue happiness in his own astonishing fashion.

But unquestionably there are certain administrative officers of whom both English instructor and research chemist are acutely aware, and in whom the typical faculty member sees personified all that makes for happiness or unhappiness in university life. I refer, of course, to the deans and departmental chairmen, the men to whom all the teaching staff looks for the recommendations that may mean academic advancement, and from whom come the occasional letters intimating an approaching termination of appointment. From the point of view of the average faculty man, in a university at least, the departmental chairman is far more important, in an immediate sense, than the president. Most of the heat I have seen engendered on my own campus has been due to friction at this particular point.

Now let's be fair to the traditional head of a department and admit that when he was of the right sort he did his job admirably. But as institutions grew large, and several men came to hold professorships in the same field, the situation both of the head and of his subordinates became increasingly difficult. This inevitable difficulty has been accentuated by the fact that certain of these executives have practiced within their own departments a

type of control which, had it been attempted by a dean or president, they themselves would instantly have denounced as tyrannical. I shall never forget that long after I had qualified as a voting member of a college faculty, and had been elected to represent that college in the general university senate, I was still utterly disfranchised when my own department met to consider the only questions on which I was qualified to vote with reasonable intelligence. Even today in that department, though an administrative committee and elected chairman have taken the place of the traditional "head," even today one hears not infrequent murmurs of discontent, because—as the protestors phrase it—"the young men are not allowed to vote on really important questions of departmental policy."

In this concrete situation, which could be duplicated on most university campuses, one sees possibly the most perplexing problem related to the organization and administration of a university. The fact that it is a relatively small part of a larger problem should not blind us to its significance. The person who can find a genuinely satisfactory formula for the organization and administration of the English department at Northwestern University can relieve our Committee T of most of its worries! For he will tell us how to make best use of the acquired wisdom and experience of our senior men, at the same time that we are paying due heed to the fresh points of view and contagious enthusiasms of the juniors. He will tell us how to achieve that happy blend of absolute democracy and benevolent despotism which will be superior to either one acting alone.

Even this relatively small problem is too large to be solved in a sentence or by any one person. Two suggestions, however, I am willing to place in the record as representing my own convictions. First, in departments of more than relatively few members the traditional "head" should be relegated to that oblivion which I confidently believe will engulf all dictators, and in his place should be created some sort of executive committee whose policies shall be made effective by an elected chairman. Second, the large department which goes much further than this in espousing the democratic hypothesis, which acts on educational and budgetary matters in a committee of the whole—such a department will pay

the heavy price of enduring mediocrity for its new-won liberties. Men who have a personal financial interest in a budget find it hard to be objective, or to estimate fairly either their own or their competitors' qualifications for advancement. They will tend to treat everyone alike, and to establish in the department a lower standard of performance than an autocratic "head" would have maintained. Hence I wonder whether we should not preserve most of the traditional prerogatives of the departmental "head" in the hands of those members who have acquired an experience and probably a wisdom that youth has yet to attain, and who can consider the qualifications of their junior associates without worrying lest their own salaries be affected by their decisions. But always, of course, such a committee will be alert for suggestions from even the youngest member of the staff, and will realize that the infiltration of an occasional new idea may benefit even, say, a well-established department of English.

Such a departmental organization will function admirably, I believe, in most routine matters. But assume now, that one of the senior members of the group, at the maximum salary level, retires for age. At once there is created a situation which tests the administrative wisdom of president, dean, and departmental committee. What should be the procedure? Should the dean and the president say, "Gentlemen, we have canvassed the matter thoroughly and are convinced that Professor X, who is now at Y university, is the best available man in this field. We propose, therefore, to nominate him to the trustees."? Or should the matter be left in the hands of the departmental committee? If the latter course is chosen, the younger members will almost certainly make their voices heard. I can imagine what I should have said fifteen years ago: "Three fourths of the retiring man's salary should be used for increases to men already on the staff; for the remaining quarter an instructor, a young man 'of promise,' can undoubtedly be secured. Let's strengthen the morale of the department by building it from within rather than from without."

If such a suggestion is adopted, no one's seniority rights are interfered with; the promotion of young men is actually rendered more probable; the morale is strengthened, superficially at least.

But what of the university's prestige in that particular field? Would it not be better, from some points of view, for the president to take a leaf from the notebook of Charles William Eliot and call the best man he can find, especially if the man would add strength where the department would otherwise be weak? This is no imaginary dilemma, hypothesized to provoke academic discussion; it is a real situation that every administration may face at any time. What will be the solution in any particular case will depend, of course, on many factors which will vary from place to place and from time to time. But the essential problem will always be the same: should we place the decision in the hands of the large group, the democracy, or should the administration assume the chief responsibility for that decision? Here again the wisest course will probably be a combination of the two; a plan which will make the departmental opinion available to the administration, but will not shackle the administration or render it wholly subservient to the department. A considerable amount of administrative freedom in such situations seems necessary if our universities are to attain the distinction which this Association covets for them. An eminent foreign educator once said to me: "We Canadians know that the University of X can always be counted on to rank higher than the University of Y. Y believes in democracy; their faculty controls promotions and new appointments; X has had presidents who have appointed great men to the faculty."

It is time to close. The program reminds me that Committee T is waiting with its annual report, which will probably solve the problems I have outlined, and many others that all of us could have mentioned. And yet the moment I write these words I realize how far they are from the truth. No committee, no association, will ever find the magic formula that can resolve all our perplexities, and reduce everything to those simple terms which leave no need for further discussion. Indeed, if I thought that university life would ever be ironed out to a dull level of peaceful regularity, that there would never again be a friendly clash of opinion between faculty and trustees, and that administrative officers and teaching staff would never engage in any arguments, but that an Elysian calm would settle over all our campuses—if I looked forward to

such a future I should be sorry for the young men who are today entering the profession. How much good fun they would miss; how dull would be their first thirty years, dull at least in comparison to yours and mine! And what excuse could some future executive secretary find for annual meetings of our Association?

Contributors

J. ALTON BURDINE is Associate Professor of Government at the University of Texas.

JOHN KUIPER is Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Kentucky.

CLAIBORNE G. LATIMER is Professor of Mathematics at the University of Kentucky.

ORLAND O. NORRIS, deceased September 23, 1938, was Professor of Education and Psychology at Michigan State Normal College.

FRANKLYN SNYDER is President-Elect of Northwestern University. For many years he was Professor of English and more recently Vice-President of the University.

CLAIR WILCOX is Professor of Economics at Swarthmore College. He served in 1936 as Principal Consulting Economist with the Bureau of Research and Statistics of the Social Security Board of the Federal Government.

HENRY M. WRISTON is President of Brown University. For some years he has been a member of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the Association of American Colleges, and for the past two years has been Chairman of that Commission.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Dr. A. D. Mueller was called to the University of Tennessee in 1929 as Associate Professor of Secondary Education. Born in 1893, and graduated in 1916 by the Wisconsin State Normal School in Milwaukee, he holds the degrees of Ph.B. and Ph.M. from the University of Wisconsin, and the degrees of A.M. and Ph.D. from Yale University. His experience in teaching and educational administration had been extensive and diversified. He had a substantial record of scholarly publication, which was continued during his period of service in the University of Tennessee. As of September 1, 1937, Professor Mueller's connection with the University was terminated. He sought the advice and assistance of the American Association of University Professors. Following an unusually careful preliminary inquiry, and patient but unsuccessful effort to obtain the retention of Professor Mueller, the Association's responsible officers sent an investigating committee to Knoxville at the end of November, 1937. The chairman of this committee was Professor John Kuiper (Philosophy) and his associate, Professor Claiborne G. Latimer (Mathematics), both of the University of Kentucky. After completing the inquiry at Knoxville, the investigators encountered unusual difficulty in the formulation of their report. They found themselves involved not only with the immediate case of Professor Mueller, but also with the entire tenure situation in the University of Tennessee. Moreover, in the Mueller case itself there was evidence of disagreement between President James D. Hoskins and members of the Board of Trustees. It was difficult to ascertain the exact facts underlying the delicate position thus created, particularly in view of conflicting assertions by different persons involved. A tentative report submitted to the interested parties in August, 1938, drew vigorous comment from both sides. Not until December, 1938, was the investigating committee able to present its report in final

form. The following statement presents the substance of the committee's report.

Concerning the particular complainant, the administration of the University of Tennessee presents a simple *prima facie* case to the effect that Professor Mueller tendered his resignation in writing, that after consideration the resignation was duly accepted, and that in consequence he has no claims upon the University. The answer to this *prima facie* case necessitates a review of general tenure conditions and of the procedure followed in the immediate case.

Tenure at the University of Tennessee

Many members of the Association will remember that the dismissal of seven professors from the faculty of the University of Tennessee in 1923 precipitated a previous investigation by the Association, and that the report of the investigating committee on that occasion indicated that tenure conditions at the University of Tennessee were unsatisfactory. All faculty members were on one-year contracts, no permanent appointments whatever being made, and any member of the staff being subject to dismissal simply through failure of reappointment. There was no provision, in the form either of legislation or of regulation by the Board of Trustees, assuring a teacher any hearing on the question of dismissal. The report respecting the situation in 1923 stated "that the Tennessee system [of appointment] is neither just nor compatible with the dignity of the profession of university teaching."¹ These general conditions of tenure still continue despite the lapse of sixteen years. They are in sharp contrast to the situation in the public schools of Knoxville, where the University is located. For the benefit of the public school teachers, tenure provisions, including the right to be heard before dismissal, have recently become effective.

With the general insecurity of tenure as a background, the procedure followed in the Mueller case gains added significance. When Professor Mueller came to the University of Tennessee, Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan was President and Dr. Hoskins was

¹ *Bulletin*, Vol. X, No. 4, April, 1924, p. 64.

Dean of the University. Professor Mueller as early as 1931 became aware that Dean Hoskins did not hold his work in high regard, but he was not then and never has been furnished with an adequate specification of criticisms. In 1933, when the University's income had been severely reduced, Dr. John A. Thackston, Dean of the College of Education, orally notified Professor Mueller that he would have to leave at the end of the year, specifying only the financial condition of the University as the cause of the proposed dismissal. Because of economic conditions and certain family considerations, it would have been disastrous for Professor Mueller to leave Knoxville at that time. He therefore appealed to Dean Hoskins and President Morgan. The latter told Professor Mueller that he had not intended Professor Mueller's removal, and Professor Mueller was retained on the staff, with a partial shift in duties which met with his approval. Dean Hoskins was still dissatisfied with Professor Mueller's work, and of this dissatisfaction Professor Mueller continued to be conscious, although no explicit criticism was conveyed to him until 1936. Dean Hoskins succeeded President Morgan in 1933. In February, 1936, Dean Thackston, with the President's authorization, informed Professor Mueller that his services would be terminated at the close of the current academic year. Professor Mueller pleaded for reconsideration, but received no encouragement from the Dean or the President. Neither did he receive a clearly informative statement of his implied shortcomings, despite his repeated requests for specifications. Struggling in the dark to hold his professional standing, and hoping to postpone his removal for a reasonable period, Professor Mueller on the advice of friends sent to President Hoskins a letter of resignation dated March 19, 1936, "effective one year from date" as contrasted with September 1, 1936, under the Dean's notice.

The Termination of Dr. Mueller's Services

It will be observed that neither in 1933 nor in 1936 was there any advance consultation with Professor Mueller about the termination of his services. The reason offered in 1933 was financial necessity alone; the reason offered in 1936 was a general state-

ment that Professor Mueller's services were not satisfactory, coupled with a reminder that he had been scheduled to go in 1933. The administration's policy was to decide *ex parte* and withhold explanation.

As already stated, Professor Mueller's resignation was offered in March. President Hoskins contends that it was "accepted at once verbally and later in writing." Unless the correspondence about the matter passing from Dean Thackston to the President and Professor Mueller is disingenuous, this assertion must be incorrect. The Dean wrote the President on July 8, 1936, after "careful consideration" recommending "that we accept the resignation . . . to take effect on the first of September, 1937." Ten days later (July 18) he wrote Professor Mueller:

This is to accept your resignation as Associate Professor of Education to take effect on September 1, 1937. It is understood that your contract with the University will end if you begin work in another position before this date.

The investigating committee finds that under all the circumstances, general and particular, Professor Mueller's resignation was not voluntary but in substance compelled. It was, in the committee's opinion, an unwise act committed by a man in despair, who hoped thereby to salvage his career in seeking another position. Furthermore, the resignation was certainly an offer to be acted upon within a reasonable time. A delay of four months under the circumstances seems unreasonable. Good business as well as good manners demanded prompter action. Still further, the attitude taken by the Board of Trustees is deeply significant as to the force attributable to the resignation. During the interval between March and July, 1936, Professor Mueller, disturbed by the silence of the administration, and assuming that his request for an honorable withdrawal had been ignored, informally approached several members of the Board of Trustees. These gentlemen gave him a sympathetic hearing, and ultimately in the summer of 1937 the Board appointed a committee from its own number to consider the problem of Professor Mueller's tenure. This committee investigated the merits of the case, at no time taking the position

that the matter was closed because of the resignation, and recommended to President Hoskins that Professor Mueller be retained in a research position. The President's rejection of this recommendation does not lessen the significance of the trustee action. Combining all these considerations, the investigating committee reaches the conclusion that the case presents fundamentally the problem of a dismissal, and not the problem of a voluntary resignation.

Viewed as a dismissal without specification of charges or a hearing, the action taken by President Hoskins violated no legal rights of Professor Mueller, because of the thoroughgoing one-year contract system in the University of Tennessee. So viewed, however, this action constituted a glaring breach of sound professional practice if Professor Mueller's relation to the University was such as to confer upon him continuous tenure. President Hoskins urges that the retention of Professor Mueller after 1933 was specifically temporary or conditional, for the purpose of giving Professor Mueller time to rearrange his affairs and also with the hope that he "would improve in the work of directing practice teaching." It should be observed, however, that Professor Mueller, already an experienced teacher, came to the University of Tennessee as an Associate Professor, a rank normally connoting permanence; and that not until well along in his fourth year of service did the administration inform him that his tenure was abnormally precarious. Security of tenure acquired prior to 1933 could not properly be defeated by the simple expedient of asserting that thence-forward the incumbent was put on trial, particularly since no reason was assigned for the threatened dismissal in 1933 except lack of funds. Furthermore, the action of the Board of Trustees in conducting its review of the case on the merits furnishes significant, practical interpretation of the relationship between Professor Mueller and the University. Bearing in mind these circumstances, and also the extraordinary hardship of a trial period covering a full eight years, or the last half of an eight-year term, and ending in the forty-fourth year of a teacher's life, it seems unreasonable to hold that in either 1936 or 1937 Professor Mueller was still justly subject to dismissal without a fair hearing.

Merits of the Controversy

Realizing that their report would be inadequate if confined to points of procedure alone, the investigators considered the merits of the controversy. They found that from 1929 to 1933 Professor Mueller (1) prosecuted field and other work among the high schools of the State, (2) represented the University on the Accrediting Commission for Secondary Schools of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, this function including the important task of inspecting secondary schools in Tennessee for purposes of accreditation, and (3) taught in the College of Education. Before the opening of the academic year 1933-1934, as already stated, Professor Mueller's assignments were changed. He ceased field work among the high schools and no longer represented the University on the Accrediting Commission. He continued his teaching in the College of Education and also (4) assumed the duties of Director of Student Teaching. President Hoskins asserts that Professor Mueller has proved unsatisfactory in every one of the four assignments described above. The President makes no complaint whatever as to the fidelity, industry, cooperation, or personal congeniality of Professor Mueller. Moreover, he concedes that Professor Mueller is competent to do educational research and has been the author of creditable books, articles, and reports while a member of the staff of the University of Tennessee.

In contrast with the unfavorable view of President Hoskins, the proposal by the Trustees' committee that Professor Mueller be retained in a research post has already been mentioned.¹ Under the circumstances, this proposal is somewhat ambiguous. At the very least it indicates appreciation by the Trustees of Professor Mueller's capability in the line of research, coupled with a proper

¹ The administration has made some effort to prove that Professor Mueller's intransigent attitude defeated the possibility of an adjustment which might have continued his connection with the University beyond the end of the academic year 1936-1937. On the strength of the relevant correspondence, including a statement by one of the Trustees who investigated the Mueller case, the investigating committee has concluded that an adjustment failed because the President rejected the proposal of the Trustees on the ground that the University budget at that time (August, 1937) would not permit the necessary revision. Professor Mueller would have been entirely willing to take the position outlined in the proposal.

recognition of the fact that in an institution on a true university level research is equally as important as instruction. It is also possible that the Trustees made a finding generally favorable to the teaching as well as the research of Professor Mueller, therefore advising his retention, but recognized the embarrassment and difficulties inherent in a blunt overruling of the President's views, and so suggested the research position.

The investigating committee conducted an independent inquiry, receiving evidence at Knoxville from faculty members; former students of Professor Mueller; and sixteen teachers, principals, and critic teachers of the city schools who voluntarily gave testimony. In addition, the committee has received letters from forty persons, most of them teachers and administrative officers in colleges and secondary schools who had studied, mainly as graduate students, under Professor Mueller. Although President Hoskins and Dean Thackston contributed little specific information, the body of evidence was substantial.

The committee makes the following findings:

1. *Work Connected with High Schools.* The principal object, or at least one of the principal objects, of Professor Mueller's original work with the Tennessee high schools, was "to keep the flow of high school graduates to the University undiminished." Having been born in Wisconsin, and received his education and taught in northern institutions, Professor Mueller obviously faced peculiar obstacles in the successful execution of this task in a southern state. This factor of difficulty was obvious to the University at the time of his appointment. The secondary school work, however, involved a feature of particular interest to President Morgan and was expected to fall within the range of Professor Mueller's special capabilities. This feature may be described as curricular construction, and embodied an effort to make the intellectual facilities of the University available to the high schools through courses of study to be followed in these schools on the basis of factual materials and procedural suggestions from appropriate departments of the University. Manifestly in the pursuit of this project it was necessary for Professor Mueller to enlist the aid of his colleagues, and it is significant to the ultimate controversy that when he sought help from Dr. Hoskins, then specially con-

cerned in the courses on Citizenship and American History, the help was refused. Others were more willing, and two of the courses of study which Professor Mueller prepared in collaboration with high school teachers and members of the University staff were adopted by the Department of Education for use in the state schools. Professor Mueller showed marked capability in writing, analyzing, and checking reports, and was uniformly courteous, cooperative, and helpful wherever he went. The investigating committee finds beyond reasonable doubt that in these respects his work was done ably and efficiently. Neither President Hoskins nor Dean Thackston gives substantial weight to Professor Mueller's admitted competence and achievements in research, taking the ground that he was not brought to the University for that purpose. President Hoskins says that Professor Mueller was "to help make the College of Education a real force in the educational program of the State of Tennessee," and obviously implies that neither research nor publication tended to the achievement of this end. The investigating committee on the contrary is clearly of opinion that Professor Mueller's research and publications did tend to make his work a real force in the State's educational program.

2. *Membership on the Accrediting Commission.* On the Accrediting Commission of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools Professor Mueller was expected to provide ideas and strong representation from the University. Here again he was necessarily handicapped by lack of previous experience in the South. As a result he did not assume an active rôle in shaping policies, and was considered insufficiently aggressive in ideas and action. Apparently he felt some distaste for the extensive travel necessitated both by accrediting commission work and by field work among the high schools. But on the Accrediting Commission his capability in handling reports, which has already been mentioned, was of great value. Moreover, he showed himself not lacking in proper moral courage, and on one occasion refused to make an exception to a rule of the Southern Association in favor of a prominent secondary school. Evidence presented to the investigating committee indicates that at the time of this incident his favor with the administration began to diminish rap-

idly. Manifestly the high school work and the accrediting commission work were closely connected. In combination they were an extremely perilous assignment. One of the professors dismissed from the University of Tennessee in 1923 had handled this assignment, and Professor Mueller was the third person in six years who failed to satisfy the demands of the administration of the University of Tennessee in the discharge of these functions. The investigating committee finds that Professor Mueller had a substantial measure of deserved success in this part of his duties, and fell short of perfection largely because of their inherent difficulty.

3. *Teaching in the College of Education.* With reference to teaching, Dean Thackston told the committee that he received more complaints about Professor Mueller than about any other member of his faculty. He would not, however, venture to say how many complaints he had received. The evidence shows that he had never given the matter serious consideration, his visits to Professor Mueller's classes having been casual and incidental and his discussion of alleged weaknesses with Professor Mueller either highly desultory or entirely lacking. Dean Thackston mentioned as a specific fault a tendency on the part of Professor Mueller to read too freely to his students from books, including his own; but Professor Mueller told the committee that he had become aware of this fault two years before his dismissal and taken immediate steps to correct it. While the committee received some evidence, originating with two former students, to support the complaint against Professor Mueller's teaching, the oral and written testimony of numerous former students, now mature men and women, was convincing that Professor Mueller is a teacher of ability, particularly at the graduate level.

4. *Direction of Student Teaching.* Professor Mueller felt particularly well qualified by training and experience to supervise student teachers, enjoyed such work, and welcomed the opportunity to do it when offered him in 1933. The committee found the available evidence on this point to be entirely in Professor Mueller's favor. No substantial complaint appeared and strong evidence indicated that he was an effective and valuable supervisor.

An important conditioning factor is the long-continued uncertainty to which Professor Mueller was subjected with respect to

his status. Without proper tenure provisions and practice, academic morale is lowered; administrators tend to become bosses; the conception of a university as a community of scholars disappears in favor of an employer-employee relationship. For fully five of his eight years in the University of Tennessee, Professor Mueller necessarily suffered from a sense of insecurity. He lived and worked for three years with the axe of dismissal over his head. He believed, and the soundness of this belief has been abundantly demonstrated by the rejection of the Trustees' suggestion for his retention, that the continuance of his tenure rested solely upon the opinion of one or at most two of the administrative officers. Subject to such worries and distractions, he performed most creditably.

Conclusions

The investigating committee concludes that the administration of the University of Tennessee made a serious mistake in judgment, injurious and unfair to Professor Mueller, in removing him from the faculty of the University. The committee finds that the evidence does not sustain the administration's charges of incompetency. The committee regards Professor Mueller as a well qualified teacher, a capable director of student teachers, and a productive scholar in educational research. The committee also finds that he cooperated in academic and civic enterprises of merit through which he contributed effectively to the advancement of the University and the community.

The committee concludes that conditions of tenure at the University of Tennessee are unsatisfactory and are not in keeping with good academic custom and usage.

The above statement is based on the findings of the special subcommittee of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure appointed to conduct the investigation, and has been approved for publication by the members of Committee A.

W. T. LAPRADE, *Chairman*

Approved for publication by the subcommittee which conducted the investigation.

JOHN KUIPER, *Chairman*
CLAIBORNE G. LATIMER

ASSOCIATION NEWS

Council Meeting

The spring meeting of the Council was held in Washington, D. C., on April 21-22. Thirty members were in attendance. The Council Record, giving a complete report of all actions taken, will be published in the October *Bulletin*.

Among the Council actions of more immediate interest were those fixing the time and place for the 1939 Annual Meeting and the appointment of the 1939 Nominating Committee.

It was voted to hold the 1939 Annual Meeting at New Orleans, Louisiana, during the Christmas week in connection with the Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association. The exact dates will be announced in the October *Bulletin*.

The following were appointed members of the Nominating Committee: William F. Edgerton (Egyptology), University of Chicago, Chairman; William Anderson (Political Science), University of Minnesota; J. Hobart Bushey (Mathematics), Hunter College; Richard H. Shryock (History), University of Pennsylvania; and William O. Sypherd (English), University of Delaware. A tabulation of all suggestions received from Association members, in accordance with the provisions of By-law No. 1, will be sent to each member of the Nominating Committee in advance of the committee's meeting which is planned for early in June. The committee's report will be published in the October *Bulletin*.

Regional and State Meetings

Athens, Ohio

An inter-regional meeting was held at Athens, Ohio, on April 15 with the chapter at Ohio University acting as host. Approximately eighty members were present from the following institutions: Ashland, Concord State Teachers, Fairmont State Teachers,

Marshall, and Pennsylvania State Colleges; the Pennsylvania College for Women; the Carnegie Institute of Technology; Denison, George Washington, The Ohio State, and Ohio Wesleyan Universities; and the Universities of Louisville, Michigan, and West Virginia. Professor R. L. Morton, Ohio University, was the presiding officer.

The program included sessions in the morning and afternoon, a luncheon, a dinner, and a reception by the Men's and Women's Faculty Clubs. At the morning meeting the following papers were presented: "The Responsibility of the Association with Respect to Incompetent Teachers," Dr. H. G. James, President of Ohio University; "A Faculty Experiment in Administrative Democracy," Professor Robert E. Mathews, The Ohio State University, member of the Council of the Association; "Academic Freedom and Tenure—a Report of the Discussion at the Recent Meeting of the Association of American Colleges," Professor James Morgan Read, University of Louisville; and "Some Phases of the Problem of Tenure," Professor R. N. Owens, George Washington University, member of Committee E on Organization and Conduct of Chapters for Region 4.

At the afternoon session the following subjects were discussed: "How to Kill a Chapter," Professor Robert Ashburn, West Virginia University; "How Chapters May Organize to Work Efficiently," Professor F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College, member of Committee E for Region 3; "Relation of the American Association of University Professors to the American Federation of Teachers," Professor W. H. Michener, Carnegie Institute of Technology, former member of the Council of the Association; and "A Plan for the Evaluation of the Services of Teaching Members of the Faculty," Professor C. L. Jamison, University of Michigan.

The dinner meeting was addressed by Professor Horace T. Houf, Ohio University, on "The Relation of the Teaching Faculty to the Board of Trustees."

Reports of the meeting indicate that this carefully prepared program proved highly stimulating to all present. Plans are being laid for a similar inter-regional meeting next year, probably in West Virginia.

Lawrence, Kansas

The third annual meeting of the Kansas chapters was held at Lawrence on April 1, the chapter of the University of Kansas acting as host. As in two previous years, the meeting was arranged in connection with the sessions of the Kansas Academy of Science and the Kansas Entomological Society. Fifty members attended two meetings, one in the morning and a luncheon meeting which extended into the afternoon. Chapters represented were those of the Universities of Kansas, Nebraska, and Wichita; Baker and Friends Universities; Bethany, Kansas State (Manhattan), and Washburn Colleges; the College of Emporia; and the State Teachers Colleges of Emporia, Hays, and Pittsburg.

The following papers were presented: "Some Desirable Features in the Set-up of a Faculty Organization," Professor J. E. Hollingsworth, Washburn College; "An Active Policy for the American Association of University Professors in Kansas," Professor William T. Paullin, University of Kansas; "Democracy the One Safeguard of Intellectual Freedom," Professor C. E. Rogers, Kansas State College; "The Association and the Teaching Profession," Professor D. A. Worcester, University of Nebraska; "The Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Governments," Professor Ernest M. Anderson, Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg).

Professor Robert Conover, Kansas State College, served as chairman of arrangements with the assistance of Professors C. V. Kent and C. J. Posey, of the University of Kansas, and of Professor D. A. Worcester, member of Committee E on Organization and Conduct of Chapters for Region 10. The central committee for integrating the activities of the state chapters, consisting of one member from each chapter, was continued under the chairmanship of Professor Conover; and a meeting of the committee was scheduled for May 13 at Emporia.

Seattle, Washington

A regional meeting for Western Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia was held on January 14-15 at Seattle, with the chapter at the University of Washington acting as host. Approx-

mately fifty members were in attendance, representing the Universities of British Columbia and Oregon, Pacific and Willamette Universities, Albany, Multnomah, Oregon State, and Reed Colleges, and the Oregon Normal School. It is to be noted that for all but two of the visiting members the minimum distance from their institutions was over 400 miles, and for the seven members from the University of Oregon, over 650 miles.

At the first session which was a dinner and smoker meeting, the members were welcomed by Dr. L. P. Sieg, President of the University of Washington, who was for many years an Active member of the Association. President Sieg observed that the American Association of University Professors is achieving in higher education some effects analogous to the influence of the unwritten British Constitution. In response, the chairman of the meeting, Professor F. L. Griffin of Reed College, member of Committee E for Region 14, pointed out that cooperation is being extended to administrators by elected faculty councils in the maintenance of high levels of faculty personnel.

This session was devoted mainly to a consideration of the general topic "Mass Education in the Colleges and Universities, and New Standards to be Applied." The first speaker, Professor Howard Taylor, University of Oregon, discussing standards for college entrance, surveyed some of the more prominent tests now in use and mentioned the doubtful evidence as to their effectiveness. He expressed his belief that the problem of the colleges would be simplified if competent guidance programs were set up in the high schools and junior colleges. Professor H. V. Tartar, University of Washington, then described the subject of special tests at the end of the sophomore or at the beginning of the junior year, his conclusion being that no sharp break needs to be made at this point in the student's career unless for the restriction of majors in departments or for the elimination of students from the institution. He also stated that the arguments for a "general education" prior to specialization do not seem convincing: the planning of curricular programs, in his view, may be left to departments.

The next subject, graduation with honors as determined by special tests, was presented by Dean Daniel Buchanan, University of British Columbia, who described the system in operation at his

institution, the sequence of examinations culminating in comprehensive examinations in the major field at the end of the fourth year. The last speaker, Dr. F. M. Padelford, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Washington, described standards in graduate schools and the admission of students thereto. At this institution, he explained, increasing attention is given to the quality of applicants for degrees before they are permitted to advance very far in their work. There followed an extended discussion in which fourteen members contributed a wide range of pertinent comments on aspects of the subjects presented by the speakers.

The session held on the next morning was given over to the presentation of the reports of two committees authorized by the meeting for this region at Portland, Oregon, July 25, 1937. Professor Willibald Weniger, Oregon State College, chairman of the regional committee on academic standards, reported at length on that part of the committee's study relating to professional loads. He described the trend toward heavier work for faculty members and the great unevenness in the duties of teachers even in the same department. His conclusion was that no satisfactory formula for the equitable adjustment of loads has been made but that competent and fair-minded administrators may be relied upon to make proper distributions. The second part of the committee's report relating to the accrediting of higher institutions was presented by Dean G. A. Odgers, Multnomah College. The recommendation of the committee that the Commission on Higher Education in charge of accrediting in the northwest be enlarged by the inclusion of representatives of a wide range in curricular fields was accepted by unanimous vote of the meeting.

Reporting as chairman of the committee on economic standards, Professor A. F. Carpenter, University of Washington, presented a summary of the statistical study made by the committee of faculty salaries in twenty-four institutions of the region. The tables prepared give the highest, lowest, and average salaries in each rank for full-time teachers. The average salary in the region for all ranks is \$2,575. It was voted to continue this committee for the purpose of further study of actual payment in salaries, comparisons of salary scales in other regions, provisions for retirement, and subventions for travel and study.

Professor R. T. Pollard, University of Washington, reported on the Annual Meeting of the Association. Professor F. B. Farquharson, University of Washington, presented information concerning an apparently flagrant violation of freedom in speech in the threatened dismissal of a college president in this region. After extended discussion the chairman was instructed to appoint a committee to investigate the case and report its findings to the officers of the Association.

Chapter Activities

Albion College. The spring meeting of the chapter was held on April 24 at the home of the chapter president, Professor D. L. Randall. A report was given on the Annual Meeting of the Association by Professor H. O. Hendrickson. Mr. F. Morris Cochran, business manager of the College, then discussed the system of group insurance by the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association and also the possibility of insurance under the Social Security Act. The program included further a lengthy discussion of the purposes of the local chapter.

Cornell University. The program of a dinner meeting of the chapter on April 13 took the form of a panel discussion of the problem of academic tenure, "more especially tenure in the ranks below the professorship." The discussion was led by Professors J. P. Bretz, E. A. Burtt, M. L. Hulse, and L. C. Petry. In the general discussion from the floor a large number participated and several different points of view were expressed. All members of the faculty were invited to this meeting and about ninety were in attendance.

University of Minnesota. At a dinner meeting of the chapter on March 16, attended by seventy members, representatives from Hamline University and Macalester College were present, in response to invitations sent to a number of institutions in the state. The speaker of the evening was Professor Mark H. Ingraham, President of the Association.

Monmouth College. A dinner meeting sponsored by the chapter on May 6 was attended by approximately 100 members and

guests, with representatives from Carthage, Coe, Cornell, Illinois State Teachers (Western), and Iowa Wesleyan Colleges. Among the guests were two members of the College Board of Trustees and their wives and Dr. R. G. Schulz, President of Carthage College, and Dr. J. H. Grier, President of Monmouth College. Professor S. M. Thompson, president of the chapter, acted as chairman. The speaker of the evening was Professor Fernandus Payne, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Indiana, who discussed the subject "The College Faculty," with special reference to the function of the faculty in administration. He suggested that faculty participation could be best effected by committees on such problems as budgets, appointments, etc. There followed a general vigorous discussion.

Mount Holyoke College. A largely attended dinner meeting of the chapter was held on February 8. A report was presented by the committee for cooperating with the work of Committee T on the Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government, the report being approved by the members present after a lively discussion. Several members made informal reports on the Annual Meeting of the Association at Chicago with special consideration of the work of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

University of New Hampshire. A luncheon meeting of the chapter was held on April 20 with twenty-five members present. A paper on the philosophy of education with reference to the recent report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "The Student and His Knowledge," was read by Professor G. R. Johnson. Professor C. S. Towle, chairman of the recently formed committee for the study of appointments and promotions, outlined the proposed procedure for the committee's activities. A unanimous vote of approval was passed endorsing President Roosevelt's reduction of the postal rate on books.

University of South Dakota. At the annual banquet and open meeting of the chapter on January 16 attended by thirty-seven members and guests, the program consisted of a series of reports by faculty members who attended mid-year conferences and conventions of professional organizations. The following presented reports of this nature: Dr. I. D. Weeks, president of the Univer-

sity, and Professors Marshall McKusick, H. Clyde Eyster, H. S. Schell, B. J. Loewenberg, Clarence Lyon, W. O. Farber, Thomas C. Geary, and E. G. Trotzig.

Swarthmore College. During the present academic year the chapter has held five meetings. The first meeting, on November 7, was devoted to a re-examination of the methods of instruction in the junior and senior years at the college. On January 9, Professor George Boas of Johns Hopkins University, member of the Association's Council, addressed the members on the subject "A Defense of Intelligence." On February 28, Professor Duncan G. Foster, member of the sub-committee of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure for the investigation at West Chester State Teachers College, spoke informally on some aspects of the investigation at this institution. On March 21, Professor Clair Wilcox presented a thorough analysis of the probable effects on members of the academic profession of the proposed extension of the Social Security Act to cover employment in non-profit institutions. At the final meeting of the year on April 19, Professor Mark H. Ingraham, President of the Association, addressed the chapter on "The Ecology of American Scholarship."

Syracuse University. Approximately fifty members of the chapter assembled for a luncheon meeting at the Faculty Club of the University on April 22. By way of following up a subject considered at the regional meeting in New York City on March 20, Professor Finla G. Crawford, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, spoke on "The Selection and Retention of Members of a Faculty." Professor Horace A. Eaton then read the paper presented at the same regional meeting by Professor Mark H. Ingraham, President of the Association. A stimulating discussion which followed dealt mainly with ways in which members of the academic profession should justify their security.

Wesleyan University. The main business of a special meeting of the chapter held on March 2 was a discussion of the admissions policy and procedure at the university. A further subject of discussion was the restatement of the principles of academic freedom and tenure recently agreed upon by a joint committee of the Association and of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the Association of American Colleges.

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

Academic Freedom and Tenure¹

By Henry M. Wriston

EDITORIAL NOTE: Report by the Chairman of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure of the Association of American Colleges to the annual meeting of that Association in Louisville, Kentucky, January 12, 1939, in explanation and support of the 1938 revised statement of principles of academic freedom and tenure formulated and agreed upon by representatives of the Association of American Colleges and of the American Association of University Professors. The full text of the statement of principles was published in the February *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors and in the March *Bulletin* of the Association of American Colleges.

The document before us does not propose to launch this Association upon a new policy. In January, 1925, the Association of American Colleges adopted a statement on academic freedom and tenure which was also adopted by the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Universities, the American Council on Education, and at least five other associations. That action, by this body, has never been rescinded. The suggestion now before us is to endorse a new statement as a substitute for the old.

It is clear that the statement of 1925 becomes the point of reference for all our discussion. It proved to be an exceedingly useful document, and pioneered in a field of great importance. Like all human enterprises it had certain defects, and because of those shortcomings a new document is now presented.

I

In the first place, the statement of 1925 was designed for adoption by boards of trustees, to be spread upon their minutes as a

¹ Reprinted from the *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges*, March, 1939.

binding program of rules governing their future actions. However, in the intervening fourteen years that hope has been almost entirely defeated. Only six or seven boards of trustees in the entire United States adopted the statement. Many presidents hesitated to submit it for adoption at all, and when submitted one board after another declined to adopt it because the document, cast in the form of mandatory rules, was regarded as transgressing charter rights which, as trustees, they were bound to maintain. Many who approved the spirit of the proposal felt that its form made adoption impossible. There was a second shortcoming, closely allied to the first: statements of principle and procedural provisions were given equal weight. Experience has inevitably established that any such equality of emphasis and authority is unwise and impracticable. In the third place, it was largely negative in tone; instead of making its affirmations positively, its principal mandates were cast in the temper of prohibitions. Finally, the old statement, with its references to treason and other matters, bears the stigmata of the twenties, rather than the marks of current issues.

These several defects the new document seeks to efface. It is not stated as a group of rules; it invites approval rather than adoption; it can not be thought to run counter to charter rights. It is an educational document, and, as such, is designed to be influential, but it is not a code to be "enforced." Boards of Trustees may well endorse it as an expression of their policy. Principles are stated with clarity, and preferred procedure is described, but procedure is no longer in a position of parity with principle. Procedure is not fixed and rigid, but may vary from college to college; rights are the same in every institution unless they are specifically limited in individual cases. One other feature represents a fresh step in advance. For practical reasons to be discussed at a later point in this report, tenure is dissociated from rank. The general tone is positive rather than negative. It looks to the current situation; doubtless ten or fifteen years from now it will have to be revised.

The new document has not been slapped together. It is the result of many meetings, and much reflection, during the last three years. Discussions were carried on with great freedom

and candor, and with consequent vigor in difference of opinion. There has never been a meeting when we did not think we might have to adjourn and throw up the task. This suggests the need to forego individualistic points of view with reference to each word and phrase within the document. A personal letter from the president of the American Association of University Professors contained the following remark, "There is no document written by a group as large as ours with as many diverse opinions where every sentence would be just what each person would write. . . . On the whole I feel it is a document we can all be happy to have had a part in framing." There are many things within this statement that I personally should like to have seen put differently. If my views had prevailed, they would have been different. But it seemed to all eminently important that we find some common denominator, therefore each one yielded his personal preferences to achieve that end. I must ask you, as you read this statement, to do the same.

The motion that I shall make at the close of my report is that this body "endorse" the statement, not "adopt" it, because this is not a treaty with the American Association of University Professors. It does not represent any "agreement" between this organization and that one. It is, if I may borrow Mr. Hull's apt phrase, a "parallel" endorsement of a common statement. It is true that it was framed by our Commission on Academic Freedom and Tenure and a committee of their association. It seemed better that two relatively stable bodies should engage in the necessary discussions, but when they were concluded, the result was not an "agreement" between these two organizations and it will not become so. That fully accounts for the fact that within this statement there is no stipulation of obligation toward that association on our part and none toward this one on their part. The document is to be presented not only to these two organizations for endorsement but also to other educational groups for their endorsement; therefore, any stipulation with reference to the obligation of one association to another is wholly irrelevant. The cooperation between the two associations is rightly based on an informal and largely unwritten understanding between their committee and our commission. It is not

affected in any way, shape, or manner by this statement. That mutual understanding may continue or it may be dropped at any time—without reference to this statement, or that of 1925.

II

Will you now read this document with me. I shall interrupt the reading frequently for comment, in order that the brief statement may be as clear as possible.

"The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure . . ." That phrase did not appear in 1925. It is designed to explain our fundamental purpose, and I do not need to insist that it is vital.

The first sentence concludes: "and agreement upon procedures to assure them in colleges and universities." "Agreement" in this context does not mean a contract but a meeting of minds; the word "agreement" is not to be taken in the sense of a treaty. It denotes a common point of view.

"Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole." This also is a new statement and one of great significance. It is most important that we should not be defensive about our institutions. Again and again we make defensive gestures, but actually the American colleges do not need to make any defensive gestures, and a statement which disdains any such attitude is refreshing. This statement also brings the individual teacher into his right perspective by pointing out that academic freedom is not for his personal benefit but for the common good.

"The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition." Certainly, the experience of Russia and Germany and many other nations makes that assertion pertinent.

"Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning." This likewise is new. The first part, of course, represents

an old tenet of belief with all of us. The last phrase is a genuine contribution to thought on this subject, and has never before appeared in such a document. It ties in with the emphasis upon the common good; it reminds us once again that this is not a protection for the teacher as an individual, but only for the teacher as such—the teacher in his teaching, and the student in his study.

"It carries with it duties correlative with rights." This is new and clear and absolutely fundamental. Again the common good is set over against the individual teacher—over against personal tastes and predilections.

"Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extra-mural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Upon freedom and economic security, and hence upon tenure, depends the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society." There is a statement of the philosophy of tenure. Tenure is not an end in itself. It is an instrument to achieve those things to which this association has long been committed—freedom in teaching, in research, in extra-mural activities, and recruitment of high-grade people for our teaching staffs.

This concludes the preamble. I think you will see that it represents an advance. The entire matter is brought into its right perspective in a public document in the form of a statement of the philosophic bases of both freedom and tenure. Both serve the rights of the student and the common good.

III

After the preamble occurs the section upon academic freedom, "The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution." The first clause covers precisely what was said in 1925, though it states it with more brevity. The second clause, about pecuniary return, is new. It is extremely important because it clarifies the moral status of research for pecuniary return,

and it will be even more important since business is continually becoming more conscious of the industrial usefulness of academic research.

"The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject." This again was in the statement of 1925. The language has been changed somewhat in the interest of greater clearness. The introduction of irrelevant controversial matter is explicitly recognized as a violation of academic freedom.

"Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment." The substance of this declaration appeared in the 1925 statement. It is important because there are institutions in the United States which have definite aims that do limit the freedom of the individual teacher. This demands that those limitations should be absolutely explicit and fully understood at the time the appointment is made.

"The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman."

A similar paragraph appeared in the statement of 1925; namely, "the teacher in speaking and writing outside of the institution upon subjects beyond the scope of his own field of study is entitled to precisely the same freedom and is subject to the same responsibility as attach to all other citizens." The new statement is an improvement because it recognizes the tri-partite relationship—first, as a citizen; second, as a member of a learned profession; and third, as an educational officer. It also acknowledges some special obligations attaching to a member of a college

faculty which result in new and very significant limitations. Furthermore, the explicit restrictions are enumerated. This is the first time that a definite and unequivocal recognition of special obligations on the part of the teacher as a citizen has appeared in any such statement.

The last sentence of that paragraph many of you will regard as of critical importance: "The judgment of what constitutes fulfillment of these obligations should rest with the individual." The 1925 statement was different, and I ask particular attention to it: "If the extra-mural utterances of a teacher should be such as to raise grave doubts concerning his fitness for his position, the question should in all cases be submitted to an appropriate committee of the faculty of which he is a member."

So far as I know, not a single institution has utilized that procedure during my chairmanship, and the previous chairman reports that it was not used while he was in office. The question arose whether the procedure outlined had ever been employed. I asked the American Association of University Professors to search its files, and received a letter stating that, so far as that office is aware, "no case has ever been referred to a faculty committee pursuant to the above quoted section." If this procedure has never been used in fourteen years, it obviously is meaningless.

I am ready to go much beyond this and to say that the old provision was probably bad in principle. That change of view is reflected in the assertion that when he acts as a citizen the teacher should be "free from institutional censorship or discipline." Those who framed this statement could see nowhere that the judgment on extra-mural activities can rest save with the individual. Obviously it is not safe if reposed there; freedom is never safe, but it is more nearly safe with the individual teacher than if lodged anywhere else. Any presumed "offence" will usually be a matter of opinion and judgment, not of fact. The question will be one of degree, and sharp lines are impossible. Some concrete examples will illustrate the point. A professor of music was secretary of the local Townsend Club. The economics of Townsendism seemed to me, to all my trustees, and to the rest of the faculty all wrong. The activities of this professor as secretary

of the club were annoying, but it fell within his right as a citizen. There were many other members of the Townsend Club including doctors and lawyers. In the late nineties a distinguished professor of economics believed in the free silver heresy. He was displaced. I suppose no one, either on the faculty or the board of trustees of his institution, believes in the free silver heresy, but likewise, no one in that entire constituency now thinks it was wise to interfere with his activities as a citizen. At a public dinner the other evening, I sat beside a very distinguished scholar. He is one of the leaders in his field in the United States, and he was denouncing President Roosevelt because, he said, the President was "propping up the decayed capitalistic system." Most of his colleagues on the faculty would not agree with that. It was just his opinion as a citizen. I could go on and give many illustrations that have come up in connection with the work of this commission.

It may be asserted that in the expression of unpopular opinions teachers have the protection of their institutions if the point of view embodied in this statement is approved. In so far, it may be argued, they will occupy a position of privilege and possess greater freedom than other citizens. Let us explore that argument for a moment. Suppose a lawyer espouses some unpopular cause. Part of his clients will leave him, but under the laws of chance, not all will. Most of them are concerned with his skill as a lawyer, and they will not make a change. Others will come to him because they like his views. Similarly, a doctor may make a tactless remark, but most people go to a doctor for physical care, not for politics; if he is skillful, his practice will not suffer greatly. With regard to preachers, Father Coughlin offers a good illustration. As a preacher he is subject to discipline, but as a citizen he is free to go on in spite of the obvious embarrassment he causes. Though his views and mine seldom are within gunshot of agreement, I am glad he is free to go on. A foreman in a factory goes out to make a political speech. Any reasonable employer regards that as his right and his views are wholly irrelevant so long as he discharges his duties in the factory efficiently. It is extremely important to remember that while a teacher appears to have greater freedom because he moves behind the ramparts of his institution, he is also more vulnerable because

a board of trustees can deprive him of his position. When that happens he loses his whole professional status at one blow and often under circumstances that make his appointment elsewhere extremely difficult. His position of peculiar freedom is more than overbalanced at present by his position of peculiar vulnerability.

I believe very sincerely that it is better for the administrative officer and better for the institution as a whole if we are in a position to say that when the teacher is acting as a citizen he does not represent us or our institutions. As long as we assume any responsibility, through committees or otherwise, for disciplining him for extra-mural utterances, we can not honestly make that assertion. But if he alone is responsible, we are free from all kinds of political and other outside pressure. If some committee or an administrative officer deals with him in connection with his actions as a citizen, we implicitly assert what we verbally deny—that he represents the institution. The statement as it is written leaves with the teacher both his rights and his obligations.

We may lose money by reason of his unpopular activity. We may even offend the city fathers, and then a resolution may pass the council asking the State legislature to make the college an independent municipal corporation, obligated to have its own water department, its own fire department—all at greater cost. Well, we may lose money by performing any of our duties—by dismissing from college the son of a rich man. I once flunked the son of a trustee who promptly cut the college out of his will and died within six months. The action had disastrous results, but I was never subjected to criticism by the administration or the faculty. I approached a rich man once for money, and he reminded me that he had been thrown out of college by one of my predecessors. I must assume that my predecessor did the right thing, although it cost me heavily years later. Cash considerations simply can not be weighed in connection with academic freedom. Freedom bought with tribute is slavery in disguise.

We are always pleased when some professor says something wise. We heard Mr. Tead discuss brilliantly the cultural rela-

tionship of the faculty to the community. But once in a while some of them say something foolish. We must remember, however, that there is always a chance that the one who seems foolish is simply smarter than we are. It has happened many times in history. Scientific advance has always been hampered by popular scepticism. Let me repeat, there is no safe place for this responsibility, but the individual is by far the least dangerous repository of these rights and duties. It is with the individual that it rests in other professions, so let it be with ours.

IV

We come now to the section on academic tenure. It begins with a statement of principle from which, I think, there will be no dissent whatever. "After the expiration of a probationary period teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their services should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies."

It then goes on to say: "In the interpretation of this principle it is understood that the following represents acceptable academic practice." This phrasing makes it clear that it is not an exclusive statement. It presents an "acceptable" method of procedure but not the only one.

The next sentence is wholly non-controversial: "The precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be stated in writing and be in the possession of both institution and teacher before the appointment is consummated." This was embodied in the 1925 statement and has long been the position of our Association.

The succeeding paragraph, however, is a new departure. "Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed six years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a

probationary period of not more than three years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of six years. Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period, if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period."

That represents a very definite change in point of view, and some of you may know—in fact it was thrown in my teeth this morning—that it represents a change in my own position. It was the last provision we agreed upon and the agreement was reached after I abandoned a point of view which I had urged continuously for three years. I therefore make no professions to consistency in this particular matter; instead, let me now tell why I changed my position. This provision divorces tenure from rank. That point I and my comrades were willing to yield from the outset, because such a decision seems inevitable under present circumstances. In the year 1928, just a little over ten years ago, there were nearly two hundred gifts to American colleges and universities of at least one hundred thousand dollars each. Last year that number was less than fifty. There was a similar decline in smaller gifts.

Furthermore, there has been a significant capital shrinkage since 1928, and the yield on sound investments is much less than it was in 1928, or that perfect year of government statisticians, 1926. Moreover, the decline in return on investments is not at an end, because with everything the government does, including the expansion of social security, it is promising us no end to deficit financing. So long as we have deficit financing, the government must maintain cheap money rates. The cost of carrying the public debt in dollars is no greater than it was in 1929, but only because the money market is regulated. It will continue to be regulated, indeed it must be regulated so long as we have deficit financing. This makes it evident that colleges will not have largely increased revenue for some time to come. Meanwhile, the student bodies have been growing. They are growing even this year.

With a static or declining income, with an enlarged student body, colleges are certain to have a larger ratio of junior officers

to senior officers of instruction. In one institution where the senior officers have increased only about ten per cent, the junior officers have increased approximately three hundred per cent. That is the situation the young teacher faces today. Moreover, most institutions have made the problem more acute by policies followed during the depression. Not wanting to move staff members because it was hard for them to find jobs, administrative officers postponed decisions until now the appointees have been so long in one college that they can not readily be moved. Departmental chairmen were reluctant during the depression to make up their minds and now find that time and circumstance have made up their minds for them. The policy here outlined was important in two of the most widely discussed cases of displacement in recent years. Many teachers have in fact acquired the substance of tenure by the unconscious decision involved in making no conscious decision at all.

Too much turnover is bad, but too little is almost equally bad. The last ten years have been too static, and we must now attempt to improve the pace of reaching decisions. The purpose of this statement is to encourage chairmen of departments to do that most difficult of all things—namely, make up their minds. All must recognize this, and it was recognized by those who participated in framing the statement. That is the basic reason for my change of view.

If this proposal becomes settled academic policy, it brings one result of first importance: the benefit of the doubt as to the retention of an instructor hereafter goes to the institution, not to the instructor. Heretofore our excuse for indecision has been that the teacher was not yet satisfactory but that, given time, he might improve. If we are not to have an indefinite number of years to appraise him, clearly the benefit of the doubt must go to the institution. This will have the effect of filtering off the undesirable teachers in the early years while they are still able to adjust themselves to occupations of another character. This provision has reference to the common good, alluded to in the preamble. Fundamentally, it is not, as it appears at first glance, so much a protection of the individual teacher as a protection of the right of the student to a teacher of undoubted competence.

As that became clear, it provided a second reason why I should alter my position.

Paragraph three is non-controversial: "During the probationary period a teacher should have the academic freedom that all other members of the faculty have." Although it is a new statement, it seems so obvious that there is no need to labor the point.

The next aspect of procedure should be scrutinized with particular care. "Termination for cause of a continuous appointment, or the dismissal for cause of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment, should, if possible, be considered by both a faculty committee and the governing board of the institution. In all cases where the facts are in dispute, the accused teacher should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him and should have the opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon his case. He should be permitted to have with him an adviser of his own choosing who may act as counsel. There should be a full stenographic record of the hearing available to the parties concerned. In the hearing of charges of incompetence the testimony should include that of teachers and other scholars, either from his own or from other institutions. Teachers on continuous appointment who are dismissed for reasons not involving moral turpitude should receive their salaries for at least a year from the date of notification of dismissal whether or not they are continued in their duties at the institution."

The substance of most of this paragraph, though not in the same language, is to be found in the 1925 statement. It is important that some such procedure should be available, but it is equally important that it does not become a matter of routine. The number of cases where the teacher elects to go through this performance are very few indeed. Once in a while it is necessary, but it is not uniformly necessary, and my experience as chairman of this commission shows the reason. Usually when a man finds that his own colleagues agree that he should be removed, he would rather resign than be subjected to formal dismissal.

There are some changes from the 1925 statement. One significant new phrase in this paragraph is "if possible." In small

institutions or in a very compact community a faculty committee might well be the worst possible place for the man to be heard. The provision for a stenographic record is also new, and is of the highest importance. Despite superficial appearances this is a very much more significant protection for the institution than for the individual. It is the only antidote against gossip; if a record is kept, and the teacher later declares that "this was said about me" or "they dismissed me on those grounds," the record may be opened to make the facts plain. The final sentence with respect to a separation allowance, also new, is in accordance with a practice common in industry, and a practice rapidly developing in the colleges. Surely we ought to recognize institutional responsibility to this extent.

I pause for just one moment here. President Weld in his report this morning said a very significant thing. We talk about being "forward looking," but if we are included in the Social Security Act, it will be because, as institutions, while we talked about being forward-looking, we did not, in practice, keep abreast of the social conscience of the times. And if the time ever comes when we must enter upon collective bargaining and are subjected to something analogous to the Wagner Act, it will be because we have clung to outworn procedures which had better be voluntarily discarded before we are forced to a line of action by the government.

The last paragraph is brief: "Termination of a continuous appointment because of financial exigency should be demonstrably bona fide." This may not be expressed in the most felicitous phrase in the world. It is my own. I did not intend, in drafting it, to give anyone offense. The plain fact is that dismissals directly due to financial emergency are really very rare. Speaking now as an administrative officer, it is much easier for me to say "no" to a man by pleading the exigencies of the budget than by denying a request on its merits. The displacement of a teacher on continuous appointment should not be merely an "economy move" but should be done only because of a genuine emergency involving serious general retrenchment. This ties up with what was said about tenure at an earlier point in the discussion. It is a reminder that purity of purpose is no defense

in the public eye, unless the purity is demonstrable. The provision is a protection to the administrative officer because it reminds him to establish the record so clearly that the exigency is as obvious to the public as it is to him.

V

I now ask you to endorse this new statement, and, in so doing, to withdraw your adoption of the 1925 statement. This document is a great improvement because it recognizes what we have learned within the last fourteen years. For example, this statement places the responsibility for extra-mural opinions on the teacher. Tenure is now in fact divorced from rank and the present document explicitly recognizes an accomplished fact. It is not expected that boards will adopt the new statement in the form of "rules" but approve it as the policy of their institutions. We should recognize that, with the disappearance of academic freedom in other parts of the world, we have got to nail it to the top of our mast so that it can not be taken down.

It is a good thing for this association to march parallel with another association which is complementary to our own. There should be no rivalry between our Association and the American Association of University Professors. The president of one of our member colleges in his inaugural address asked the pointed question: "Who is the college?" Certainly we are not the college. Certainly the board of trustees is not the college, except as a legal personality. Certainly the students alone are not. Certainly the members of the faculty are not—nor are the alumni. The college includes them all. A faculty member is not an employee; he is an officer of the college, an integral part of its structure. Trustees establish the trust, we administer it, the faculties execute it—all for the benefit of the students and, through them, in the public interest. There is a diversity of function but an identity of interest. We are indissolubly linked in a common enterprise.

One last word, and I shall claim your indulgence no further. What does endorsement mean? We have, as an association, no power whatever to prescribe to any individual member institu-

tion what it shall do. Therefore, endorsement does not require any action on the part of any member college. Your vote to endorse this document gives moral support to a sound statement of principle and practice, and that is all it does. In so far as you are individually persuaded and believe in it, the statement becomes part of your policy as an administrative officer. If your board of trustees endorses it, the document becomes part of the policy of your institution. In either event it must remain subject to all the acids which affect all other policies, because policy must inevitably have flexible characteristics.

COMMUNICATIONS

Professional Association or Trade Union?

The following correspondence is concerned with the views expressed by Dr. Arthur O. Lovejoy in an address, "Professional Association or Trade Union?" which was published in the May, 1938, *Bulletin*. Dr. Lovejoy's address was delivered at a meeting of New York chapters of the Association held at Columbia University, March 13, 1938, and in part at the Annual Meeting of the Association in Indianapolis, Indiana, December 31, 1937. This exchange of opinions should be of interest to every member of the Association.

October 11, 1938

Dear Mr. Lovejoy:

Your address on "Professional Association or Trade Union?" in the *Bulletin* for May, 1938, strikes me as exceedingly clear and penetrating. The point of view that you uphold could not be better stated. But one's point of view in this matter depends partly upon the range of one's data, and partly upon the social setting that contributes to the meaning of even the narrowest data. Though your words seem to imply that we can find our way through the problem of teacher-organization without evaluating any of the social forces that play upon our profession, I hesitate to attribute to you any such sweeping abstraction. Your long and valiant defense of academic freedom has repeatedly brought you face to face with the fact that the chief forces that work against our freedom are extra-academic. Moreover, you have recognized as one of our problems the maintenance of the civil liberties of teachers. On these grounds, even if there were no others, one might assert that the academic interests that the American Association of University Professors sets itself to promote are continuous with and inseparable from some of the interests of society in general. But there are wider grounds for this assertion. A university is not in any respect a self-sufficing entity. It not only draws its physical sustenance from outside

itself, being dependent upon the productive labor of many who never enter its walls; its own organic consciousness includes a sense of being part of a fellowship that is broader than the fellowship of learning merely. Academic learning carries within itself an urge towards ends beyond that of merely adding knowledge to knowledge. I am confident, therefore, that you do not advise either individual professors or our Association to be neutral with respect to all social issues, but only with respect to some of them.

General modes of social organization, whether political, economic, or ecclesiastical, include attitudes towards truth, towards the technique for ascertaining truth, and towards institutions that practice particular techniques for ascertaining it. If ever we had a doubt that this of itself involves science in social conflict, present world conditions should annihilate the doubt. The academic attitude towards truth is itself a social attitude that every member of our Association would make universal. Science, as an ongoing affair, is a realized fellowship. Its method, which is its vital breath, includes listening to one another, and reciprocal modification of one another through unrestricted communication. One's standing within this fellowship is not determined by race, color, creed, or possessions, but solely by the extent of one's ability and readiness to perform functions that in one or another degree are universal functions of persons as such. Here is a democratic relationship; here democratic forces are at work. I am inclined to think that in the depth of this relationship, and in the worldwide sweep of it, we behold the greatest achievement thus far made by the democratic spirit. When, now, we ascribe universal validity to the principles of science as method, we imply that science as such is committed to a principle of social order—even an outgoing or missionary principle. When we teach the rising generation we endeavor to habituate it to a discriminated type of relationship among human beings generally. When we publish, we proceed as if we desired all men to share our insight and to participate in the relationships through which insight grows. Hence the anxiety of men of science with respect to the spread of fascism and nazism. By virtue of the central principles of the American Association of University Professors we are opposed to the social presuppositions and modes of social organization that produce the

academic conditions that exist in Italy and Germany. We are not neutral. We are, indeed, glad to listen to the most learned possible description and defense of any social actuality in these countries. No social creed is imposed upon our members, and heresy trials, either open or covert, are unthinkable; yet we are not neutral. If we condemned academic suppression, yet endeavored to be neutral with respect to known sources of suppression, how could we call ourselves men of science?

Almost immediately after reading your address there fell into my hands a statement of the objectives of the Northwestern University branch of the American Federation of Teachers. The main difference that I discern between this declaration *pro* and your declaration *anti* is that this professors' union, after going the whole way with you in your definition of professional standards, assumes that still other aims and standards are obligatory upon our profession. Further, it places the problem of academic freedom within the concrete social context that provides the dynamics and the contemporary meaning of higher education. It explains the attitude of some professors to the labor movement. They see in this movement an expression of basic meanings in American history; they regard the emancipation of labor as necessary to the maintenance and development of democracy; they are convinced that if democracy goes down, science will go down with it; hence, even as up-holders of the freedom of science, they find themselves participating in the struggles of labor.

The distinction that you make between a professional organization and a labor union was made, in principle, by the American Federation of Teachers at or near the beginning of its history when it explicitly renounced the use of the strike by teachers. Some of the effects of this professionalizing of American Federation of Teachers policies I have witnessed in the day-by-day activities of a local union that included in its membership all grades of teachers from kindergarten to university. Invariably, I think, the sense of responsibility for performing a public service was predominant in this union. The affiliation with the American Federation of Labor is an affiliation only, for the American Federation of Teachers is entirely autonomous. Further, there prevails within it continuous free criticism of the A. F. of L. The affilia-

tion exists partly because teachers share the employe-employer relationship in the manner that you feelingly describe, but partly also because the A. F. of L., more than any other non-professional body, has steadfastly and actively promoted the best interests of the public schools. In general, organized labor, whether A. F. of L. or other, can be relied upon to support freedom of teaching.

Should not we professors consider whether the problem of freedom of teaching and learning does not pervade our whole system of education, not merely higher education; therefore whether there is not needed an organization that includes both academic teachers and teachers in secondary and elementary schools? Should we not also realize that our struggle for freedom as teachers is part and parcel of the present conflict between types of social organizations? If the answer to these questions, or to either of them, is affirmative, it follows that the American Association of University Professors should either broaden its purposes or else accept teachers' unions as professional colleagues.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE A. COE

January 16, 1939

Dear Mr. Coe:

I thank you heartily for your obliging and interesting letter and for your kind expressions about a speech of mine recently printed in the *Bulletin* of our Association. The letter puts with so much force and eloquence reasons for dissenting from the conclusions of that speech, that I have sent it to the Editor of the *Bulletin* with the suggestion that it also be published, and am assured by him that he agrees that it should be. With his permission and yours, I am now setting down, for publication in the same number, some further comments on the question at issue, with special reference to your letter.

1. You present a reasoned argument for a practical conclusion which you believe I and others should accept. I should, of course, wish to accept it, if the argument for it is sound. In seeking to judge of the soundness of an argument, I find it clarifying to reduce it to its essentials, expressed, so far as possible, in brief and simple terms. One, and perhaps the principal, argument in your

letter (in the second and third paragraphs) appears to be, in substance, the following: (a) Science implies or presupposes democracy; we can not consistently be men of science without believing in democracy. (b) Democracy implies or requires the "emancipation of labor." (c) Therefore, we do not consistently act as believers in democracy—which our belief in science requires us to be—unless our Association is organically affiliated with a labor organization, and, specifically, with the A. F. of L.

The premises of this reasoning can, I think, be construed in a sense in which I should consider them valid, though the first of them, especially, seems to me equivocal, and in one sense false. If "democracy" is used to signify or imply freedom of inquiry, of thought, and of expression, the proposition is true; there can be no genuine science without such freedom. If the proposition means that what is more commonly understood by "democracy"—the rule of the majority—is the only system under which such freedom is possible, and that this system of itself guarantees freedom, the premise is not self-evident, and is contradicted by experience. Freedom is not identical with the existence of any form of government or society; its essence lies in the limitation of the power of government or of any social group to coerce the individual; and the oppression of minorities is possible under political democracy, as it is under any other system. I do not suppose you dissent on this sufficiently obvious point, and I take the term "democracy" to be used in a sense, or rather, senses, which would permit me to accept your premises. But, given the premises, I ask myself whether the conclusion follows.

Now if the third proposition follows from the first and second, it equally follows that *any* organization whose members believe in democracy should become affiliated with the A. F. of L.; for the nub of your argument is that loyalty to democracy on the part of members of an organization requires such affiliation of the organization. I do not know whether you intend so sweeping a consequence to be drawn from your reasoning; I only point out that it is the consequence which that reasoning entails. An argument similar in its logic to your own might be offered by an ardent eugenicist: (a) The quality of scientific work in a community depends on the quality of the brains of those who carry on that work,

and all who believe in the value of science must in consistency believe in the great importance of having as many good brains as possible; (b) the quality of brains depends upon eugenic mating; (c) therefore, all organizations composed of persons who believe in the value of science should be affiliated with the Eugenics Association. Without disputing the premises of this argument, I should regard the conclusion as fantastic and should deny that it follows from the premises; and I find myself obliged to say the same of your conclusion. I conceive that it is permissible and desirable for men—and even democratic men—to associate themselves together for any useful object upon which any group of them may agree, even though they may disagree about other matters, including trade unions and eugenics. The general aims of trade-unionism, I myself, with you, believe to be legitimate and of great social importance. I do not deduce from this belief which we hold in common the conclusion that there should be no organizations which are not trade unions, or "affiliated" with them. But unless this general conclusion is admitted, the particular conclusion at which you arrive—namely, that any association of university teachers should be a trade union—can not be inferred from the premises you propound. If there may legitimately be organizations not affiliated with the A. F. of L., among believers in democracy, each case must be considered separately, in the light of the specific ends which a given organization is designed to serve and of the concrete conditions which will determine its effectiveness in the accomplishment of those ends.

Now there are certain ends of great importance to our profession and to our higher educational institutions, and therefore to society, which *can* be furthered by organization of the members of the profession; about certain of these ends there is a close approach to unanimity among our colleagues, who differ on many other issues, including that of formal affiliation with the organizations of industrial labor; and the condition of maximum effectiveness in the accomplishment of the ends that are of peculiar and immediate concern to our profession is the union of *all* its members who agree as to those specific ends, whatever else they may disagree about. To insist that the organization must officially declare itself—which certainly implies that its members, or the majority of them,

must agree—as to other ends, about which you and I may be of one mind but others are not, is to oppose united organized effort for the present accomplishment of objects, educational and professional, which you and I *and* nearly all others of our calling believe in and are ready to support.

There are those, of whom I am one, who think that, in the present juncture in world-history, the most urgent and momentous problem, even more urgent than the labor problem and not less critical for the future of democracy and of science, is that concerning the best means of promoting international peace and order—non-resistance, or isolationism, or “appeasement” of dictators, or collective security, or economic boycotts of aggressor-states. But it has never occurred to me to urge that our professional association should take sides in this controversy in favor of my own view, or affiliate with the particular peace organization which supports that view. Yet, upon the principle of non-neutrality on vital issues, which you appear to favor, there should be four or five such organizations of professors. With respect to the problem of methods and aims in the improvement of the system of economic production and distribution, college and university teachers are, besides the many conservatives, presumably divided into supporters of two competing types of trade-unionism, of the New Deal or Deals, the Socialist Party, Stalinite Communism, Trotskyite Communism, the American Labor Party, and the new La Follette party. Each of these doctrines seems to its adherents not less vital to human interests than your own social philosophy seems to you; and the adherents of each could frame—though, so far as I know, none has framed—an argument, in form strictly parallel with yours, for the affiliation of our Association with their own group. But no organization can support all these programs, since they are for the most part in violent opposition; if neutrality—on issues which any group believes to be fundamental—is to be avoided, there should be six to eight associations, nominally professional, but none of them likely to be devoted to our own distinctive professional problems, interests and duties. I am unable to regard a principle which, if consistently carried out, would lead to such consequences, as providing a sensible basis for the organization of university teachers, under

existing conditions, for the maintenance of educational standards, the improvement of teaching, the strengthening of our sense of our common professional responsibilities, and the defense of freedom of investigation, discussion, and opinion in universities. Must we wait until we agree in our general social philosophies before getting together to deal with "the instant need of things" and working together in one organization for purposes on which we are nearly all of us already agreed? Is not the refusal so to get together itself a manifestation of that spirit of intolerance of dissent which so easily besets any of us who feel strongly on social or moral, not to speak of religious, questions—and is always the chief obstacle to cooperation in activities in which effective and useful cooperation would otherwise be entirely possible?

Observe that, with respect to these larger ulterior questions, I distinguish between the neutrality of individuals and the neutrality of organizations. This distinction—of which you seem to miss the point—was fundamental in the argument of the latter part of the speech to which you refer. I would not have "individual professors" neutral on *any* of these questions; nor, of course, do I deny the right of individuals to combine with others, of any and all callings, to advance causes in which they believe. But the point is that the members of a distinct professional group who are not as individuals neutral on other matters but are, on the contrary, in disagreement about them, can and should unite in a single association for the promotion of definitely professional aims, standards, and principles about which they are generally in accord. Your argument may be—and, taking its terms in a certain sense, in my opinion is—a perfectly good argument for the conclusion that *individuals* should support the labor movement in its general objectives, if not in all of its actual methods—just as the eugenicist might offer a good argument for the support of *his* movement by individuals. But as an argument concerning the proper basis of *organization*—in the present actually divided state of opinion on large social policies—of the members of a particular calling, for the realization of limited but important professional objectives, your reasoning seems to me wholly irrelevant. It at all events disregards completely the considerations on this matter which were chiefly emphasized by me.

2. There is, however, another argument in your letter which *is* directed to an issue of special professional concern, and therefore seems more pertinent to the question under discussion. It runs—if I may state my understanding of it briefly—thus: On academic freedom, at least, our Association should not be, and is not, neutral. But it is not enough to oppose particular efforts to suppress such freedom in this or that instance. The tendency to suppression arises from certain deeper “sources” connected with “general modes of social organization.” We, therefore, not only as individual men of science, but as an organization opposed to the suppression of intellectual liberty, should direct our efforts to the removal of these “sources” and the establishment of a social and economic system free from them, in which academic freedom will be no longer threatened. You do not specify in what system that happy consummation would be attained; but you again deduce, from these somewhat different premises, that our Association should be an affiliated member of the A. F. of L.

I find this argument a little difficult to appraise until I know what you conceive the fundamental “sources of suppression” to be, what “mode of social organization” you favor, and why you think the proposed affiliation would tend to remove the source of the evil. Who is to determine what the general source is, or must we have as many professional associations as there are current opinions concerning the nature of that source and concerning the ultimate ideal society? There are doubtless some among us who think that the “mode of social organization” which we should now seek to realize is a dictatorship of the proletariat, or the state ownership and control of all the instruments of production and processes of distribution. There are others who think that these systems, by putting all power into the hands of a single party, or of state officials, would increase rather than diminish the danger of suppression of individual liberties in general, and of academic freedom in particular—and point to the recent history of Soviet Russia as evidence upon the point. These are merely two familiar samples—there are plenty of others—of the opposing opinions of thoughtful men about the mode of social organization that is to be desired. No man ought, I think, to be a member of this Association who believes that the suppression by government of

freedom of investigation and of thought in universities, or outside them, is a good thing; and the Association may, in my opinion, properly denounce such suppression wherever it appears, whether in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, or Soviet Russia. But if there are in our profession—as I know there are—Socialists and Communists, as well as Democrats and Republicans, New Dealers and opponents of that program, supporters and critics of the A. F. of L., who sincerely believe in academic freedom (and in the numerous other aims of our Association), I see no reason why organized co-operation between all of them for these purposes should be prevented by what you appear to advocate—namely, the commitment of the Association as such to some particular theory concerning the best “mode of social organization” in general. It is, I repeat, not necessary or sensible to demand that we should agree about ultimate ends before we agree upon any immediate ends. It is likely to be some little time before all professors subscribe to the same social philosophy. Meanwhile, there are many things, known to all of us, that we can do in these United States for the better performance by our profession of its distinctive function and for the improvement of conditions in the institutions in which its work is carried on; and we shall be best able to do these things if we continue to go about them as a united and organized body.

3. That the interests of universities and of men of science are “inseparable from some of the interests of society in general” and that university teachers are “part of a fellowship that is broader than the fellowship of learning merely,” is undeniable. But here again I fail to see how your conclusion respecting our organization follows from these true premises. An individual scholar’s contributions to knowledge are themselves a recognition of that larger fellowship, as are his civic activities, his religious affiliation, and many other modes of participation in the general life of the community. But this no more implies that an *association of* teachers for certain special purposes must be affiliated with a particular body representing the interests of labor than that it must be affiliated with bodies representing other interests—with a political party, a church, a peace society, a farmer’s alliance, a civil service reform league, a tax-reform association, or a hundred other legitimate and useful organizations having their own special

platforms and activities. If any conclusion follows from the general considerations which you so justly express, it is that an organization representing the entire body of university teachers and investigators should avoid permanent alliance with any one special interest—even so valid and important a one as that of industrial labor. Farmers are a part of the "broader fellowship," as well as the employees of industries; the interests of the two groups are, though politicians like to gloss over the fact, often opposed; there are, indeed, no two groups whose material interests are in the long run more obviously opposed, since the permanent interest of the factory-worker is in low prices of food and high prices of manufactured articles, the interest of farmers is in high prices of food and low prices of manufactured articles; and this would be the case in any economic system. When such conflicts of interest arise, our individual members should be free to take whatever side their own judgment approves, and our economists and social philosophers should contribute by their individual researches to the rational adjustment of these conflicts. But as a body we are not called upon to take sides; and we shall more effectually serve the special interest of society at large that is committed to us as a professional group, if we address ourselves to what are plainly our own problems, and, in our collective capacity, remain as "neutral" in these other conflicts of opinion and interest as are, in their corporate capacity, the universities in which we serve. I assume that you do not propose that all universities should affiliate with an organization representing some particular interest not specifically educational or scientific. You and I both, I take it, want universities as such to be neutral on non-educational issues, while their individual members are not and should not be; this "neutrality" is precisely what is meant by academic freedom. Why, then, should an association of teachers of all universities for educational and professional objects be less "neutral," with respect to other objects, and less free?

4. In your final paragraph you observe that the American Association of University Professors should "accept teachers' unions as professional colleagues" and that there is "needed an organization that includes both academic teachers and teachers in secondary and elementary schools." Of course all teachers are in a sense professional colleagues; and a closer *liaison* between

educational organizations of teachers in schools and those in colleges and universities seems to me, for several reasons, desirable. It is, however, also true that the special problems of the two groups are in many respects distinct, the difference arising from the differing characters and functions of the two types of institutions; and, as a practical matter, it would be disadvantageous to both if their organizations were to lose their identity and independence by completely merging in a single undifferentiated body. The needed *liaison* can best be had by provision for frequent conference between them, by occasional joint-meetings, and by active cooperation when situations arise in which the interests of both alike are involved. Such cooperation was exemplified in the fight against teachers'-oath bills. But even supposing a single organization of all teachers to be desirable, it would not follow that this should be a teachers' "union" affiliated with the A. F. of L. For the reasons already given, it should not be; and in so far as organizations of non-university teachers are "unions," those reasons would forbid fusion, though not cooperation for particular common ends. The same reasons, and others, I must add, seem to me to hold good against the permanent affiliation of professional associations of teachers in elementary and secondary schools, and especially public schools, with any organization representing the interests of a special economic or other militant non-educational group, however important and however beneficent its general purposes may seem to many of us to be. But, since this letter is already too long, I can not fully develop here the grounds for this view; I have tried to formulate them elsewhere (in an article in the *Educational Review*, 1920, pp. 106 ff.). The question we are now concerned with is whether an association of college and university teachers can best perform *its* special service to society by sticking to its immediate and necessary tasks, as to the nature of which there is a pretty general consensus among us, without demanding of its members allegiance to other organizations devoted to other purposes. As I have already intimated, the real question at issue is whether we want academic freedom within the Association.

With high regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY

Faculty Compensation for Extension Courses

The following letter refers to a resolution adopted by the 1938 Annual Meeting of the Association. (See Annual Meeting Record, April, 1939, *Bulletin*, page 243.)

March 6, 1939

My dear Dr. Himstead:

I am sending this statement in reply to your letter of February 28 in connection with the resolution of the American Association of University Professors of vigorous condemnation of the "practice of determining the salary of a teacher wholly or in part by the enrolment in his courses, whether such courses be offered in the extension division, summer school, evening classes, and the like, or as a part of the usual curriculum of his institution."

The comments that I am sending are based on over a quarter of a century of experience in conducting extension courses in Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware.

I am heartily in favor of this resolution, provided the same rate of compensation is applicable to extension work as to courses offered on the campus. It is notorious that this is not true and that is the chief reason why the pay in extension courses is often determined by the attendance. It is notorious that the institutions make no appropriation for extension courses. These courses must not only carry their own weight but they must yield a profit to the institution. The institution will not sponsor them unless they do yield a profit to the institution. This practice, of course, is wholly out of line with the practice that obtains for campus courses. No first-class institution in the country could continue work for a day if its income were dependent on the tuition fees. The campus courses are subsidized either by state appropriations or by endowment. It is notorious that extension courses, on the average, do not yield more than about one-third as much as the same courses yield when offered on the campus except in the case of institutions that allow the instructor to share in the revenues of large courses. As a matter of fact, many of the extension courses do not yield even one-third as much as the campus courses because the instructor often has to spend four or five hours in traveling to and from the extension center. It is equally notorious that many first-class

instructors refuse to do any extension work because of the limited compensation, in consequence of which inferior men who need to supplement their small salaries are often assigned to this work. The cure for the situation contemplated by your resolution is to allow at least the same compensation for extension courses as for campus courses. Even thus, the compensation would be less because of the increased amount of time required.

There are other evils connected with extension work that should be thoroughly investigated by the Association and reported upon with appropriate recommendations. I refer particularly to the low standards and the lax requirements that are followed by many instructors who offer extension courses. I have for a quarter of a century offered courses in competition with some instructors who practically set no standards whatever. I have in mind, for example, one instructor from a large university who has been able to secure a sufficiently large enrolment to conduct his classes in a certain extramural center for about seven years. This instructor sets practically no standards whatever, he uses no textbooks, he makes no assignments, he does not require term papers, even though graduate credit is given to students who have the baccalaureate, and his examinations are a pure farce. Nevertheless, practically all students who have pursued his courses have been given A's or B's, according to the reports that have reached me. I have in mind another instructor from a large university who offers three credits per semester for a course that has lasted not even two periods and, therefore, should at the most have yielded not over two credits. Even worse than this, his requirements are exceedingly lax. He does not give any tests or final examinations but has the students write a brief paper or two on the books they have read. I have read many of these papers, most of which contained only a couple of handwritten pages and which could have been written by anyone who had only read one chapter in the books concerned. In fact, many of the teachers pursuing this course have stated that they did not read more than a couple of chapters and that they received the largest amount of credit for the smallest amount of work in their experience, and yet this man, and others associated with him, hails from one of the largest institutions in the country. In his courses students have been able

to get graduate credit without meeting any reasonable standards whatever. Every paper that I have read was marked A or B, usually A, and these grades appeared on the semester grade cards.

There are other evils that exist, such as offering credit for certificate renewal in extension courses in which practically no requirements are exacted.

My suggestion would be that a committee be established by the American Association of University Professors to investigate this matter thoroughly and to make comprehensive recommendations for the proper regulation of extension courses. There is no reason why such courses should be given at all unless reasonable standards are maintained. One recommendation of this committee might very well be that an association be organized of instructors in extension or extramural courses and that this association should lay down standards and appoint a committee to investigate the requirements in all extension courses and "blacklist" all institutions that do not maintain proper standards.

I have been trying to maintain exactly the same standards in the extension field as in campus courses but it has been very difficult to do so because of the "cutthroat" methods employed by some instructors in this field who want to supplement their regular salaries through income from extension courses.

Very cordially yours,

J. E. W. WALLIN

Correction

The name of E. J. Weekes was, by regrettable oversight, omitted from the list of Contributors in the April issue of the *Bulletin*. Dr. Weekes, author of the article "Values of the Chapter in the Small College," is Professor of English at Berea College.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to *all* college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions, *including graduate students, graduate assistants, and instructors*. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the regional accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership is by the Committee on Admissions following nomination by three present members of the Association who need not be on the faculty of the same institution as the nominee. Election can not take place until thirty days after the nomination is published in the *Bulletin*. Nomination forms, circulars of information, and other information concerning the Association may be procured by writing to the General Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

The classes and conditions of membership in this Association as provided by the present Constitution, By-Laws, and regulations are as follows:

(a) *Active*. To become an Active member, it is necessary to hold, and to have held for two years, a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an eligible institution and be devoting at least half time to teaching or research. At the discretion of the Committee on Admission of Members service in foreign institutions may be counted toward the two-year requirement. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(b) *Junior*. Junior membership is open to two classes: persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions, or persons now teaching in eligible institutions who are qualified for nomination as Active members except in length of service. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(c) *Associate*. Associate members include those members who, ceasing to be eligible for Active or Junior membership because their work has become primarily administrative, are transferred

to the Associate list with the approval of the Council. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

(d) *Emeritus.* Any Active member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred, at his own request and with the approval of the Council, to Emeritus membership, which allows exemption from dues, with receipt of the *Bulletin*, if desired, at \$1.00 per year.

(e) *Life Membership.* The Treasurer is authorized by the Council to receive applications from Active and Associate members for Life membership, the amount to be determined in each case on an actuarial basis. This includes a life subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Nominations for Membership

The following 259 nominations for Active membership and 33 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admissions if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

The Committee on Admission of Members consists of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher College, *Chairman*; H. L. Crosby, University of Pennsylvania; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette College; A. Richards, University of Oklahoma; W. O. Sypherd, University of Delaware; and F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College.

Active

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Isaac S. McAdory; **University of Alabama**, Helen Bosard, John M. Bruhn, Gladys E. Knight; **University of Arkansas**, Rudyard K. Bent, Virgil D. Cover, Paul W. Milam; **Baylor University**, John T. Summerhill; **Boston University**, George Levene; **Bowling Green State University**, Florence Litchfield; **Brooklyn College**, Hans Rosenberg, Louise M. Rosenblatt, Hildegarde Wichert; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Robert G. Simpson; **Carroll College (Wisconsin)**, Dorothy Richardson; **Centenary College of Louisiana**, Irma Broadwell, Don Brown, Mabel Campbell, Elizabeth Davidson, John B. Entrikin, Elmer L. Ford, W. Darrell Overdyke, Arthur M. Shaw, Robert E. Smith, Stewart A. Steger, Mary Lou

Ware, Mary Warters; **University of Cincinnati**, Jessie L. Paul; **The City College (New York)**, Raymond E. Lisle, Charles H. Page; **Coe College**, Myron L. Koenig; **Colgate University**, Alfred S. Brown; **University of Colorado**, Ralph L. Crosman; **Columbia University**, Kay G. Marshall, Jesse H. Newlon, Geroid T. Robinson; **Connecticut State College**, John H. Marchant; **Cornell College**, Neil A. Miner; **Cornell University**, M. Lovell Hulse, Whiton Powell; **Creighton University**, Edwin Puls; **Drew University**, Dorr Diefendorf; **Duke University**, Ray C. Petry, James D. Poteat; **Duquesne University**, Earl P. Guth; **Emory University**, John E. Tilford, Jr.; **College of Pharmacy of Ferris Institute**, Simon Benson; **Findlay College**, Martica Georg, Elbert E. Magoon; **Fordham University**, Francis Downing, William Frasca, John R. Hart, John Redden, Joseph R. Sherlock; **Fresno State College**, George H. Huntting, Paul V. Sheehan; **George Washington University**, William R. Compton; **University of Georgia**, Walter Couto, Rhoda Permenter, Rufus H. Snyder, Andrew E. Terry, Kenneth R. Williams; **Harvard University**, Otto Oldenberg, Theodore Spencer; **Hastings College**, Vernon B. Fleharty; **University of Hawaii**, Harold J. Hoflich; **Henderson State Teachers College**, John A. Hamilton, Mary E. Marshall; **Hunter College**, Florence Brumbaugh, Mary S. Epstein, Marjorie L. Langenbahn, Anne S. Loope, Madge M. McKinney, Jean T. Wilde; **Illinois College**, Frederic B. Oxtoby; **Illinois State Normal University**, Kenyon S. Fletcher, Howard J. Hancock, Clifford E. Horton, Edward R. Johnson; **Illinois State Normal University (Southern)**, Victor Randolph, Grace Wilhelm; **Illinois State Teachers College (Eastern)**, Donald R. Alter; **Indiana University**, Robert Tangeman; **Intermountain Union College**, Lincoln J. Aikens, Theron O. Odlaug; **Jamestown College**, Foster Y. St. Clair; **John B. Stetson University**, Charles B. Vance; **Kansas State College**, Fred L. Parrish; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Jacob Uhrich; **University of Kansas City**, Madeline Ashton, Leslie L. Eisenbrandt, Henry G. Hilken, C. DeWitt Norton; **University of Kentucky**, Wendell E. Beals, William F. Gallaway, Marshall D. Ketchum, Roy Moreland, Frank H. Randall, W. Gayle Starnes; **Lake Forest College**, Karl A. Roth; **Louisiana State University**, R. E. Arne, Fred G. Brazda, William H. Carter, Albert E. Casey, Rudolf Heberle, William A. Lawrence, Mary E. Loup, Lewis B. Lucky, J. R. Shoptaugh, Harley Smith, Margarete Teer; **Luther College**, C. R. Waldehand; **Marshall College**, Mary Ann Williamson; **University of Maryland**, Carl S. Joslyn; **Western Maryland College**, Lawrence C. Little; **Michigan State College**, Herbert C. Beeskow, Donald O. Buell, Richard A. Fennell, Lloyd H. Geil; **University of Michigan**, Norman H. Anning; **University of Minnesota**, William P. Dunn; **Mississippi State College**, William J. Evans, Newton F. Hamlin, John F. Locke, Norman M. McCorkle, Robert C. Weems, Jr.; **Missouri State Teachers College (Southeast)**, Martha Shea; **University of Missouri**, Norma Leavitt; **Monmouth College**, Milton M. Maynard, Ruth M. Williams; **Mount Holyoke College**, Hildegard Stücklen; **Murray State Teachers College**, William E. Derryberry, Beatrice Frye, Charles Hire, Clifton S. Lowry, Gordon B. Pennebaker, A. M. Wolfson; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne)**, Lenore P.

Ramsey; Newark College of Engineering, Odd Albert; University of North Carolina, Lancaster D. Burling; Northwestern University, Albert A. Campbell; Ohio State University, Herbert Edwards, Joseph H. Gourley, Louis E. Raths, Ralston C. Thompson, Charles L. Williams, David C. Williams; Ohio University, Margaret Hampel; Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Sherman M. Kuhn, Matthew W. Rosa, Eleroy L. Stromberg; Municipal University of Omaha, Nell M. Ward; Oregon State College, D. Thomas Ordeman, Lloyd E. West; University of Oregon, A. Halfred Young; Pennsylvania State College, Leslie E. Dills, Laura W. Drummond, George W. Henninger; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (West Chester), Thelma Greenwood, Mary Holland, Thelma Mellien, Winfield W. Menhennett, Josephine E. Wilson; University of Pennsylvania, W. Carlton Harris, Hobart S. Perry; Purdue University, Howard M. Baldwin, Richard Crowder, Albert R. Fulton, William Hastings, John R. Lindsay; Reed College, Marcus D. O'Day; St. Joseph's College (Pennsylvania), Alfred H. Weber; St. Louis University, J. Manuel Espinosa, Norbert Furst; Santa Barbara State College, Harry Girvetz; Seton Hall College, George W. King, Jr.; Seton Hill College, John Hugo, Helen V. Irwin; Simmons College, Jessie M. Stuart, Caroline Holt; Northern State Teachers College (South Dakota), Ruth Allen, Charles E. Booth, Lida M. Williams; University of South Dakota, H. C. Eyster, Thomas C. Geary, Ella Lokken; University of Southern California, Willard G. Smith, Robert E. Vivian; Springfield College, Leonard A. Larson; Swarthmore College, John W. Nason; Syracuse University, Reginald D. Manwell, Joseph A. Russell, Burton W. Taylor; Temple University, W. Edward Chamberlain, Elden S. Magaw, David F. M. Ulrich; Tennessee State Teachers College (Middle), Neal D. Frazier; University of Tennessee, Kenneth Curry; Texas State College for Women, F. L. McDonald, Carl Wiesemann; Texas State Teachers College (Southwest), M. L. Arnold, Carroll L. Key, J. Lloyd Rogers, Hugh F. Seabury, John H. Vordenbaum, Dallas S. Williams; University of Texas, G. Lowell Field; Thiel College, John B. Stoerber; Tufts College, Lewis F. Manly, Frederic N. Weaver; University of Tulsa, Claude A. Levengood; Ursinus College, Everett M. Bailey; Utah State Agricultural College, Halbert Greaves, Leon B. Linford, Vance H. Tingey; Vassar College, Clarence A. Brodeur; University of Vermont, Roy J. Wietz; Villanova College, Anthony J. Lamberti, John A. McClain; Western Washington College of Education, Ruth A. Burnet, Donald G. Bushell, Moyle F. Cederstrom, Jack C. Cotton, Marjorie E. Dawson, Irene M. Elliott, Victor H. Hoppe, Evelyn Odom, Ruth E. Platt, Hazel J. Plympton, Charlotte B. Richardson, Evelyn A. Rupert, Leona Sundquist, E. Wilma Trent, Anna Ullin, Elsie A. Wendling; University of Washington, Siri Andrews, Kenneth C. Cole, Verne F. Ray; West Virginia University, James B. Lowther; Western Reserve University, Blanche Harvey, Helen M. Jordan, Benjamin R. Simpson, Eleanor Yeakel; Westminster College (Pennsylvania), Virginia Everett; College of William and Mary (Norfolk Division), Calder S. Sherwood III, Edward L. White; Williams College, Robert R. Brooks, Alfred G. Emslie, Roy Lamson, Jr., Samuel A. Matthews, William B. Wilcox; Wilson Teachers College, Paul O.

Carr, Mary S. Cookson, Anna D. Halberg, Ellis Haworth, Ralph B. Kennard; Wisconsin State Teachers College (LaCrosse), Marie Park; College of Wooster, Lawrence C. Boles, E. Kingman Eberhart.

Junior

Boston University, Lindsay Cleveland, Biagio Di Venuti; Centenary College of Louisiana, Lucile A. Tindol; Cornell University, Clark M. McBurney; Creighton University, Robert E. Hanna; Duquesne University, Charles R. Davis; Emory University, Howard M. Phillips; Franklin and Marshall College, Clifford Marburger; Hastings College, Charles J. Thurmond; Louisiana State University, Jean Deval, Alan D. Grinstead; Marshall College, Neil D. Richmond; University of Minnesota, Bess Dworsky, Edward W. Hamilton; Missouri State Teachers College (Southeast), William A. Mueller; University of New Mexico, Walter Keller; Northwestern University, Edwin J. Lewis; Pacific University, Gerald W. Breese; University of Pennsylvania, James R. Hibbs; Purdue University, Jay W. Wiley; Reed College, Demorest Davenport, Douwe Stuurman; St. Lawrence University, Frank W. Yeaw; St. Louis University, Guy G. Harper, Joseph F. Sharpe, James Wade; Scripps College, Wyndham M. Southgate; Northern State Teachers College (South Dakota), Stella Yates; University of Tennessee, Frank Harrison; Washburn College, Gertrude Ullman; Westminster College (Missouri), Chester Alexander; Williams College, Philip H. Coombs; Not in University Connection, Roland C. Burton (M.A., Illinois), Trenton, N. J.

Members Elected

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election of 414 Active and 60 Junior members as follows:

Active

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Frank S. Arant, Henry G. Good, Edna J. Orr; University of Alabama, Walter H. Bennett, M. E. Butterfield, Weldon Cooper, Robert E. Jones; Albany College, Donald E. Faber, Lucius O. McAfee, William H. Norris, Edgar I. Stewart, Barbara A. Thompson, Mildred G. Witt; Allegheny College, Louis J. Long, Herbert Rhinesmith, William R. Tongue; University of Arkansas, William Horsfall; Baylor University, Frank Bain; Boston University, Hugh W. Babb, Charles C. Parkhurst; Bowling Green State University, Gilbert W. Cooke, Leon E. Fauley; University of British Columbia, Frederick S. Nowlan; Brooklyn College, Paul H. Baginsky, Mary E. Barnes, Arthur Lapan, Leslie K. Patton, Irving W. Raymond, Stanley Rypins, Louis B. Salomon; Brown University, Benjamin W. Brown, Alfred Herrmann; Bucknell University (Wilkes-Barre), Arthur

Bernhart; **University of Buffalo**, Fritz Machlup; **Butler University**, Virginia G. Brunson, Clarence Efroymson, Kenneth J. Martin, James F. Price; **University of California at Los Angeles**, Helmut Hungerland, Hallock F. Raup; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, W. Frank Hitchens, C. E. Leberknight; **Case School of Applied Science**, Mathew M. Braidech; **Catholic University of America**, Jules Alciatore; **Central College**, Gilbert K. Robinson, **Central Y. M. C. A. College**, Charles M. Whitlo; **University of Chicago**, Lyman Fourt, Paul A. Nicoll, Joseph J. Schwab; **University of Cincinnati**, Gaylord M. Merriman; **The City College**, R. B. John Byers, Alexander S. Chaikelas, William H. Fagerstrom, John Hazam, Barnet Naiman, John G. Peatman, Lawrence W. Sherritt; **Colorado State College**, Lowell W. Charkey; **Columbia University**, Hoxie N. Fairchild, Irving Lorge, Justin O'Brien; **Creighton University**, Henry Linn, James F. Walsh; **De Paul University**, William F. Clarke; **DePauw University**, Walter E. Martin, Vernon Van Dyke; **University of Detroit**, L. Robert Blakeslee; **Drew University**, J. Newton Davies, Ralph A. Felton, Geoffrey W. Stafford, James V. Thompson; **Duke University**, William B. Hamilton, John H. Roberts, Bayrd Still; **Duquesne University**, Lewis C. Cassidy, Julian Sigmar; **Emory University**, Loy B. Cross; **Evansville College**, Heber P. Walker; **University of Florida**, Rollin S. Atwood, Oscar Heskin, John M. MacLachlan, George O. Phelps, Thomas B. Stroup; **Fordham University**, Joseph A. Koonz; **Franklin and Marshall College**, Charles D. Spotts; **Fresno State College**, James R. Burkholder, Earl H. Coleman, Afton Y. Eliason, Albert R. Lang, John W. Masten, Hubert Phillips, William E. St. John, Willard F. Tidyman; **Furman University**, Aileen Coggins; **George Washington University**, Samuel N. Wrenn; **University of Georgia**, Edward S. Sell, Florene M. Young; **Goucher College**, Ruth M. Cruikshank; **Grinnell College**, Sara S. Pryor; **Grove City College**, Carl Fink; **Harvard University**, Karl Viëtor; **University of Hawaii**, Matthew Graham; **Hunter College**, Frances H. M. Holsten, Patria A. Gosnell; **University of Idaho (Southern Branch)**, Esther Stalker; **Illinois State Normal University (Southern)**, Tracy L. Bryant, Maude Mayhew; **Illinois State Teachers College (Eastern)**, Jessie M. Hunter, Walter M. Scruggs, Mildred Whiting; **University of Illinois**, Gerhardt von Bonin; **Indiana University**, Samuel T. Burns, Nelson Grills, Robert S. Tangeman; **Intermountain Union College**, Homer K. Moore; **Kansas State College**, W. H. Riddell; **Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)**, John F. Dietrich, Norman R. Eppink; **University of Kansas**, Raymond J. Eastwood, John E. Hankins; **University of Kansas City**, Robert D. W. Adams, Glenn G. Bartle, Charles F. Bassett, Harold P. Brown, Harold Buschman, Helen S. Clancey, William L. Crain, Sidney E. Ekblaw, Clyde E. Evans, Joel W. C. Harper, Frank E. Hoecker, Carl C. Johnson, Milan S. La Du, Royce H. LeRoy, William A. Luby, Kenneth L. Mahony, Orin G. Sanford, Miriam M. Wagner; **University of Kentucky**, Sallie E. Pence; **Lake Forest College**, Martha Biggs; **Lawrence College**, George A. Douglas, John H. Graff, LaVahn Maesch; **Louisiana State Normal College**, Esther Cooley; **Louisiana State University**, Ella V. Aldrich, Pasquale Amato, Robert E. Atkinson, David Bender, Beatrice Borbridge, Daniel

Borth, Jr., Melvin G. Dakin, Dallas Dickey, Joe Farrar, Louis Ferraro, Harold A. Frediani, Polly Gibbs, Max Goodrich, Harriet Idol, Willmore Kendall, Clifford A. King, Henry G. McMahon, Joyce Michell, George H. Mickey, Walton R. Patrick, Edward B. Robert, Richard L. Schanck, E. Donald Sisson, J. Denson Smith, Allan J. Stanley, Albert J. Stephens, William W. Tison, Richard Valente, Robert P. Warren; **Luther College**, Emily Frank; **Lynchburg College**, S. Elizabeth Clarke, Estella K. Cochran, Alice C. Ferguson, Joseph L. Ferguson, William W. Ferguson, Oswald J. Grainger, Joseph N. Leinbach, Maurice J. Murray, Glen W. Rardin, Ollie M. Sills, Richard C. Sommerville; **Macalester College**, Marion Boggs, Mary G. Owen; **University of Maine**, Ruth Crosby, Milford E. Wence; **Marshall College**, M. Virginia Foulk, Lucy E. Prichard; **University of Maryland**, L. Ingemann Highby, Willard A. Laning, Jr., James H. Reid; **Miami University**, William B. Bain; **Michigan State College**, Ernest M. Banzet, Fred W. Foster, Albert H. Gower, Mildred Jones, Madison Kuhn, Milton Muelder, Daniel F. Sheehan, Joseph F. Sykes, Justin Zinn; **University of Michigan**, Hazel M. Losh, Warner G. Rice; **University of Minnesota**, Clara M. Brown, Asher N. Christensen, Mykola Haydak; **Missouri State Teachers College (Northwest)**, George H. Colbert, June Cozine, Alline Fentress, Dora B. Smith; **Missouri State Teachers College (Southeast)**, Helen G. Allison, Rosina M. Koetting, Wilhelmina L. Vieh; **University of Missouri**, Richard L. Crouch, Lemen J. Wells; **Missouri Valley College**, Richard M. Warnock; **State University of Montana**, Robert C. Line; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney)**, Bernice D. Dunlavy; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne)**, W. A. Wollenhaupt; **University of Nebraska**, Warren R. Baller, Ralph Bedell, Mark W. Delzell, Don W. Dysinger, Wilbur S. Gregory, Lloyd B. Snyder; **University of Nevada**, Fred J. Collins; **University of New Hampshire**, Edward R. Atkinson, Joseph E. Bachelder, Jr.; **New York University**, Gregory Mason; **Newark College of Engineering**, Paul E. Nielsen; **Woman's College of the University of North Carolina**, Alice K. Abbott, Anna Reger, Madeleine B. Street; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Christian E. Kaslow; **University of North Dakota**, Max Demorest, George Feinstein, Wayne L. McNaughton, Julia E. Mattson, Elwin J. O'Brien, Arthur Saastad, Harry Spangler, Charles W. Telford, Neal A. Weber; **Northwestern University**, William H. Cornog; **Ohio State University**, Violet C. Boynton, Irwin A. Johnson, Robert D. Lewis, Josephine H. MacLatchy, Reinhold Nordsieck, Gladys E. Palmer, Wendell D. Postle, John A. Reimers, Jennette A. Stein, Geneva G. Watson, M. Emett Wilson; **Ohio University**, Forest L. Shoemaker, Hazel Willis; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, Sybil Gould; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, Harold M. Cleland, McKee Fisk, J. Frances Henderson, Bernard O. Heston, O. A. Hilton, Edward F. Willis; **University of Oklahoma**, Stewart Harral; **University of Oregon**, Frank G. Black, Kenneth S. Ghent, Bertram E. Jessup; **Pacific University**, Edward G. Hargreaves; **Pennsylvania State College**, Charles L. Allen, Virginia Arbuckle, Della J. Avery, MacLean M. Babcock, Emmett A. Betts, T. M. H. Blair, William C. Bramble, Clarence E. Bullinger, Michael R. Cannon, Arthur F. Davis, Donald

W. Davis, William V. Dennis, Jesse S. Doolittle, George J. Free, John F. Friese, Bratton R. Gardner, Edith V. Harding, Edward C. Henry, Howard W. Higbee, Robert A. Hussey, William Jeffrey, Mildred A. Lucey, Ina Padgett, Dorothy Quiggle, Raymond W. Swift, Glenn Thiel, Wilfred O. Thompson, Leroy Voris, Clifford C. Wernham, Wallace E. White, Allen E. Wierman, Mary L. Willard, Harlan N. Worthley, Henry L. Yeagley; **University of Pennsylvania**, J. Russell Doubman; **University of Redlands**, Clarence Hendershot; **Rockford College**, Melitta Gerhard, Mabel Staudinger; **Rollins College**, Arthur D. Enyart, John W. McDowall, Guy Waddington, Alexander Waite; **College of St. Elizabeth**, Gertrude Helff; **St. John's University**, Charles J. Kiernan; **St. Lawrence University**, Bert W. Alverson; **St. Louis University**, Maurice M. Hartmann, Henry L. Hunt, John A. Kerans, Bernard J. Muller-Thym, Harry J. O'Neill; **St. Mary-of-the-Woods College**, Dorothea Fitzgerald; **Santa Barbara State College**, George E. Outland, Helen E. Sweet; **Scripps College**, Beatrice E. Richardson, Arnold Bergstraesser, Charles M. Brooks, Jr., Margaret R. Gay, W. K. Jordan; **Shepherd State Teachers College**, Stewart E. Arnold, John Newcome, Ella M. Turner, Etta O. Williams; **Simpson College**, Hiram S. Doty, George W. Weiler; **Skidmore College**, Kathryn H. Starbuck; **Smith College**, Neal H. McCoy, Ann E. Mensel, Louise Rood, Edward F. Willett; **University of Southern California**, Carl C. Lindegren; **Southern Methodist University**, Laurence H. Fleck, Ransom D. Landon, J. Lon Tinkle; **Stanford University**, Herbert Goldhamer, William S. Hopkins; **Swarthmore College**, George A. Bourdelais, Fredric S. Klees, Frances Reinhold; **Syracuse University**, Frederick A. Herrmann; **Temple University**, Elinor M. Brown, Herbert M. Cobe; **University of Tennessee**, Florence V. Essery, John J. Fuller; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, William V. Cash, Dan R. Davis, Glenn Dooley, J. Marshall Miller, Daniel Russell, David W. Thorne; **Texas State College for Women**, Earl C. Bryan, Bertha Duncan; **Texas Technological College**, Truman W. Camp, Arthur W. Young; **University of Texas**, Malcolm Y. Colby; **Tulane University**, E. Scott Barr; **University of Utah**, Bronson Stringham; **Vanderbilt University**, Ruth W. Poindexter; **University of Vermont**, Archibald T. Post, A. Bradley Soule, Jr.; **Medical College of Virginia**, Jesse H. Weatherby; **Western Washington College of Education**, E. J. Arntzen, Nora B. Cummins, Emma S. Erickson, Lucy Kangley, H. C. Philippi, C. P. Poole, Herbert C. Ruckmick, C. C. Upshall; **Washington University**, Dietrich Gerhard, Frank Urban; **University of Washington**, Henry A. Burd, Joseph Demmery, Carlos Garcia-Prada, Merrill Jensen, Arthur R. Jerbert, J. Kenneth Pearce, Thomas M. Rowlands, Calvin F. Schmid, Ivar Spector, Edwin B. Stevens, E. Roscoe Wilcox, Carl P. Wood; **Wayne University**, Ralph Busick, Mildred M. Connely; **Western Reserve University**, Bertil G. Anderson, Theodor Braasch, Lyon N. Richardson, Myron Schaeffer; **Municipal University of Wichita**, John Haff; **College of William and Mary (Norfolk Division)**, William G. Akers, Ernest W. Gray, Perry Y. Jackson, David S. Prosser, Frances Saunders, A. Lee Smith, L. W. Webb, Jr.; **Williams College**, Peyton Hurt; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (LaCrosse)**, Myrtle Trowbridge, Emma L.

Wilder; **University of Wisconsin**, Harry Harlow, Ragnar Rollefson, J. Gibson Winans; **Xavier University**, Lawrence Ferring, Florence M. Hornback, Stephen P. Ryan.

Transfers from Junior to Active

Duke University, Mary Poteat; **Municipal University of Omaha**, Benjamin Boyce, Laura M. Johnson, Leslie O. Taylor, Pearl H. Weber.

Junior

University of Alabama, Cecil E. Abernethy, Winston Adair, Harold F. Cotter, Ralph Dailard; **Allegheny College**, Joseph L. Fisher, Edward H. Johe; **Bryn Mawr College**, Theodore M. Steele; **University of Buffalo**, Thomas H. Jameson; **University of Chicago**, Sunder Joshi; **Creighton University**, John T. Lawlor; **Dartmouth College**, Thomas H. LeDuc; **Emory University**, Lewis W. Beck; **University of Florida**, George R. Bentley, James D. Haygood; **Fresno State College**, Karl Falk; **Furman University**, Barbara Laier; **John B. Stetson University**, G. Leighton LaFuze; **Kansas State College**, Hillier Kreighbaum; **University of Kansas City**, Benjamin F. Boyer, Horace S. Moses; **Lawrence College**, John W. Dowling; **Louisiana State University**, J. Norman Efferson, Ira D. George, Clet A. Girard, Jr., Lindsay H. Lacy, Estelle S. Lower, James E. Seay, Ralph W. Steele, Herman Walker; **Lynchburg College**, Katherine K. Hodges; **Michigan State College**, William F. Hewitt, Jr.; **Missouri State Teachers College (Southeast)**, Oliver M. Skalbeck; **Monmouth College**, Louis Gibb, W. Malcolm Reid, Leon M. Reynolds; **Mount Union College**, Allan W. Donaldson; **University of North Dakota**, G. Björn Björnson, Hermann F. Buegel, Clarence Kulischeck, Myrtle Pedersen; **Ohio University**, Edward Davidson, John Lembach; **University of Oklahoma**, William E. Livezey, Constance Payne; **Pennsylvania State College** J. Roger Fredland, William J. Gaskill, Wendell E. Keeper, Charles E. Stevenson, Doris M. Unsworth; **Pennsylvania State Teachers College (West Chester)**, Willard J. Trezise; **St. Lawrence University**, Stuart Wright; **Skidmore College**, John K. Reeves; **Southern Methodist University**, Dudley W. Curry, Donald Gallup, Morris T. Keeton; **Temple University**, Roy B. Hackman; **University of Tennessee**, Margaret C. Franklin; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Harold A. Dulan; **Washington and Jefferson College**, Fred P. W. McDowell; **College of William and Mary (Norfolk Division)**, Donald C. Gordon, Frank A. MacDonald, Cherry Nottingham; **Williams College**, Henry Hatfield; **Winthrop College**, Gordon T. Chappell; **Not in University Connection**, John L. Finan (Ph.D., Yale), Annapolis, Md.; Nellie D. Greenburg (M.S., Purdue), Nashville, Tenn.; Henry Idzkowsky (Ph.D., Pittsburgh), Loretto, Pa.; Helen Miner (M.S., Michigan), Nazareth, Mich.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

The Association is glad to render service to appointing officers and teachers by publishing the information below. The officers of the Association can, however, take no responsibility for maintaining a register or for making a selection among applicants. It is optional with the appointing officer or the applicant to publish the address in the announcement or to use a key number. In the latter case those interested may address their communications to the General Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Vacancy

English: Man, instructor, to teach freshman English (both literature and composition) and speech in western college. V 1097

Teachers Available

Art: Woman, 38, M.A. 11 years' college art experience. Now employed, desires advancement. Available September. A 1635

Bible: Man, 32, married. Will receive Ph.D. in June 1939. 4 years' college experience. Old and New Testament, Church History, Philosophy of Religion. Desires a place in a school of religion or a church-related college. Phi Beta Kappa and Delta Sigma Rho. Now employed; desires change. A 1636

Chemistry, Chemistry Engineering: Ph.D. 12 years' teaching Physical, Inorganic, Analytical and Industrial Chemistry, Chemical Engineering, Microscopy, etc. 12 years industrial research, consulting, testing, etc. Numerous publications. Employed in industry. Wish to return to teaching. A 1637

Classics: Man, 35, married. Ph.D., Pennsylvania. 11 years' university teaching. Publications, research. Special field: Roman Private Life. A 1638

Economics: Woman, Ph.D. Teaching experience in public school and college. Special field, International Trade. Other interests, Economic History, Money and Banking, Public Finance, Labor Problems, Marketing, Economic Geography. Available September. A 1639

Economics: Man, 37, married. Ph.D. Illinois. 7 years' college teaching. 8 years' industrial experience. Special field: Theory and Consumption. Other interests: Economic Reform, Labor. Desires change to large college or university with opportunity for specialization and research, preferably north central or east. Available June or September. A 1640